

Edward R. Bates

June 8 1834 — —

Hamillton
N.Y.

Rel 217 - Vol XV
The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations.

AN

A D D R E S S

BEFORE

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,

AT ITS ANNIVERSARY IN BOSTON, MAY 28, 1849.

BY HON. CHARLES SUMNER.

That it may please Thee to give to all nations unity, peace and concord.

THE LITANY.

What angels shall descend to reconcile
The Christian States, and end their guilty toil.—WALLER.

B O S T O N :

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, 21 CORNHILL.

1854.

“I look upon the way of *treaties*, as a retiring from fighting like beasts, to arguing like men, whose strength should be more in their understandings than in their limbs.”
—CHARLES I. *Eikon Basilike*.

“We daily make great improvements in natural — there is one I wish to see in moral — philosophy; the discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another’s throats. When will human reason be sufficiently improved to see the advantage of this.”—FRANKLIN.

“La meme politique qui lie, pour leur bonheur, toutes les familles d’une nation les unes avec les autres, doit lier entre elles toutes les nations, qui sont des familles du genre humain. Tous les hommes se communiquent, même sans s’en douter, leurs maux et leurs biens, d’un bout de la terre à l’autre.”—BERNARDINE DE ST. PIERRE.

“Only the toughest, harshest barbarism of past ages — War — remains yet to be vanquished by our innate anti-barbarism. There is a growing insight of its unlawfulness.”—JEAN PAUL.

“War is on its last legs; and a universal peace is as sure as is the prevalence of civilization over barbarism, of liberal governments over feudal forms. The question for us is only, *How soon?*”—Emerson.

THE WAR SYSTEM

OF

THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN, — We are now assembled in what may be called the Holy Week of our community ; not occupied by the pomps of a complex ceremonial, swelling in tides of music, beneath time-honored arches ; but set apart, according to the severe simplicity of early custom, to the Anniversary meetings of the various associations of charity and piety, from whose good works our country derives such true honor. Each association is distinct. Within the folds of each are gathered its own peculiar members, devoted to its own peculiar objects ; and yet all are harmonious together ; for all are inspired by one sentiment, the welfare of the united Human Family. Each has its own distinct orbit, a pathway of light, while all together constitute a system which moves in a still grander orbit.

Of all these associations, there cannot be one so comprehensive as ours. The prisoner in his cell, the slave in his chains, the sailor on his ocean wanderings, the Pagan on his distant continent or island, and the ignorant here at home, will all be commended to you by eloquent voices. I need not tell you to listen to these voices, and to answer to their appeal. But, while mindful of all these interests, justly claiming your care, it is my special and most grateful duty to-night, to commend to you that other cause — the great cause of Peace — which, in its Christian embrace, enfolds the prisoner, the slave, the sailor, the ignorant, all mankind ; which, to each of these

charities, is the source of strength and light, I may say of life itself, as the sun in the heavens.

Peace is the grand Christian charity, the fountain and parent of all other charities. Let Peace be removed, and all other charities sicken and die. Let Peace exert her gladsome sway, and all other charities quicken into celestial life. Peace is a distinctive promise and possession of Christianity. So much is this the case, that, where Peace is not, Christianity cannot be. There is nothing elevated which is not exalted by Peace. There is nothing valuable which does not contribute to Peace. Of wisdom herself it has been said, that all her ways are pleasantness, and all her paths are Peace. Peace has ever been the longing and aspiration of the noblest souls — whether for themselves or for their country. In the bitterness of exile, away from the Florence which he has immortalized by his Divine Poem, pacing the cloisters of a convent, in response to the inquiry of the monk, — “What do you seek?” Dante said, in words distilled from his heart, *Peace, peace*. In the memorable English struggles, while King and Parliament were rending the land, a gallant supporter of the monarchy, the chivalrous Falkland, touched by the intolerable woes of war, cried in words which consecrate his memory more than any feat of arms, *Peace, peace, peace*. Not in aspiration only, but in benediction is this word uttered. As the apostle went forth on his errand, as the son left his father’s roof, the choicest blessing was *Peace be with you*. As the Saviour was born, angels from Heaven, amid quiring melodies, let fall that supreme benediction, never before vouchsafed to the children of the Human Family, *Peace on earth and good will toward men*.

To maintain this charity, to promote these aspirations, to welcome these benedictions, is the object of our society. To fill men in private life with all those sentiments, which make for Peace ; to animate men in public life to the recognition of those paramount principles, which are the safeguards of Peace ; above all, to teach the True Grandeur of Peace, and to unfold the folly and wickedness of the INSTITUTION of War and of the whole WAR SYSTEM, now recognized and established by the COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS, as the mode of determining *international* controversies ; — such is the object of our Society.

There are persons, who sometimes allow themselves to speak of associations like ours, if not with disapprobation, at least with levity and distrust. A writer, so humane and genial as Robert Southey, has left on record a gibe at the "Society for the Abolition of War," saying, that "it had not obtained sufficient notice even to be in disrepute." It is not uncommon to hear our aims characterized as visionary, impracticable, Utopian. It is sometimes hastily said that they are contrary to the nature of man; that they require for their success a complete reconstruction of his character; and that they necessarily assume in him qualities, capacities and virtues, which do not belong to his existing nature. This mistaken idea was once strongly expressed by the remark, that "an Anti-War Society seemed as little practicable as an anti-thunder-and-lightning society."

It cannot be doubted that these objections, striking at the heart of our cause, have exerted great influence over the public mind. They proceed often from persons of unquestioned sincerity and goodness, who would rejoice to see the truth as we see it. But plausible as they may appear to those who have not properly meditated this subject, I cannot but regard them — I believe, that all who will candidly listen to me to-night will hereafter regard them — as prejudices, without foundation in reason or religion, which must yield to a plain and careful examination of the precise objects of our society, and of the movement which it represents.

Let me not content myself, in response to these critics, by the easy answer, that, if our aims are visionary, impracticable, Utopian, then the unfulfilled promises of the prophecies are vain; then the Lord's Prayer, in which we ask that God's kingdom shall come on earth, is a mockery; then Christianity is a Utopia. Let me not content myself by reminding you, that all the great reforms, by which mankind have been advanced, have encountered similar objections; that the abolition of the punishment of death for theft was first suggested in the Utopia of Sir Thomas More; that the efforts to abolish the crime of the slave trade were opposed almost in our day, as impracticable and visionary; in short, that all the endeavors for human improvement, for knowledge, for freedom, for virtue, that all the great causes which dignify human history, — which save it from being a mere protracted War Bulletin, a common sewer, a *Cloaca Maxima*, flooded with perpetual uncleanness — have been pronounced Utopian, while, in spite of distrust, of predjudice, of en-

mity, all these causes have gradually found acceptance, as they gradually became understood, and the Utopias of one age have become the realities of the next.

Satisfactory to many minds as such an answer might be, I cannot content myself on this occasion with leaving our cause on such grounds. I desire to meet directly the objections which have been made, and by a careful exposition of our precise objects, to show that these objects are in no respect visionary; that the cause of Peace does not depend for its success upon any reconstruction of the human character, or upon holding in check the general laws of man's nature; but that it deals with man as he exists, according to the experience of history; and above all, that the immediate and particular aim of our Society, the abolition by the Commonwealth of Nations of the Institution of War, and of the whole War System, as an *established* Arbiter of Right, is as practicable as it would be beneficent.

And I begin by carefully putting aside several questions, which have occupied much attention, but which an accurate analysis of our position shows to be independent of the true issue. Their introduction has heretofore perplexed the discussion, by transferring to the great cause of International Peace the doubts by which they have been encompassed.

One of these is the alleged right, appertaining to each individual, to take the life of an assailant in order to save his own life — compendiously called the *right of self-defence*, usually recognized by philosophers and publicists as founded in nature, and in the instincts of men. The exercise of this right is carefully restrained to cases where life itself is placed in actual jeopardy. No defence of property, no vindication of what is called *personal honor*, justifies this extreme resort. Nor does this right imply the right of attack; for instead of attacking one another for injuries past or impending, men need only have recourse to the proper tribunals of justice. There are, however, many most respectable persons, particularly of the denomination of Friends — some of whom I may now have the honor of addressing — who believe that the exercise of this right, even thus limited, is in direct contravention of high Christian precepts. Their views find faithful utterance in the writings of Jonathan Dymond, of which at least this may be said, that they strengthen and

elevate, even if they do not always satisfy the understanding. "I shall be asked," says Dymond, — "suppose a ruffian breaks into your house, and rushes into your room with his arm lifted to murder you, do you not believe that Christianity allows you to kill him? This is the last resort of the cause. My answer to it is explicit—*I do not believe it.*" But while thus candidly and openly avowing this extreme sentiment of non-resistance, he is careful to remind the reader, that the case of the ruffian does not practically illustrate the true character of war, unless it appears that war is undertaken simply for the preservation of life, when no other alternative remains to a people than to kill or to be killed.

But according to this view, the robber on land, who places his pistol at the breast of the traveller, the pirate who threatens life on the high seas, and the riotous disturber of the public peace, who puts life in jeopardy at home, cannot be opposed by the sacrifice of life. Of course, all who subscribe to this renunciation of the privilege of self-defence, must join with us in efforts to abolish the Arbitrament of War. But our appeal is addressed to the larger number, who make no such application of the Christian precepts, who recognize the right of self-defence as belonging to each individual, and who believe in the necessity at times, of sorrowfully exercising this right, whether against a robber, a pirate, or a mob.

Another question, closely connected with that of self-defence, is the alleged *right of revolt, or of revolution*. Shall a people endure political oppression or the denial of Freedom, without resistance? The answer to this question will necessarily affect the rights of three million of fellow-men, held in slavery among us. If such a right unqualifiedly exists — and sympathy with our fathers, and with the struggles for Freedom now agitating Europe, must make us hesitate to question its existence — then these three million of fellow-men, into whose souls we thrust the iron of the deadliest bondage the world has yet witnessed, would be justified in resisting to death the power that holds them in fetters. A popular writer on Ethics, Dr. Paley, has said: "It may be as much a duty, at one time, to resist government, as it is at another, to obey it; to wit, whenever more advantage will, in our opinion, accrue to the community from resistance, than mischief. The lawfulness of resistance, or the lawfulness of a revolt, does not depend alone upon the grievance which is sustained or feared, but also upon the probable expense and event

of the cause." * This view distinctly recognizes the right of resistance, but limits it by the chances of success, founding it on no higher ground than expediency. A right, thus vaguely defined and bounded, must be invoked at any time with reluctance and distrust. The lover of Peace, while admitting, that, in the present state of the world, an exigency may unhappily arise for its exercise, must confess the inherent barbarism of such an agency, and admire, even if he cannot entirely adopt, the sentiment of Daniel O'Connell: "Remember that no political change is worth a single crime, or above all, a single drop of human blood."

But these questions I put aside; not as unimportant, not as unworthy of the most careful consideration; but as unessential to the establishment of the great cause which I have so much at heart. If I am asked — as the advocates of Peace are often asked — whether a robber, a pirate, a mob may be resisted by the sacrifice of life, I answer that they may be so resisted — mournfully, necessarily. If I am asked, if I sympathize with the efforts for freedom now finding vent in rebellion and revolution, I cannot hesitate to say, that, wherever Freedom struggles, wherever Right is, there my sympathies must be. And I believe I may speak, not only for myself, but for our Society, when I add, that, while it is our constant aim to diffuse those sentiments which promote good will in all the relations of life; which exhibit the beauty of Peace everywhere, in the *internal* concerns, as well as in the *international* relations, of States; and while we especially recognize that grand central truth, the Brotherhood of Mankind, in the clear light of whose far-darting beams all violence among men becomes dismal and abhorred, as among brothers; it is nevertheless no part of our purpose to question the right to take life in honest self-defence, or when the public necessity distinctly requires it, nor to question the justifiableness of resistance to urgent outrage and oppression. On these several points there are individual diversities of opinion among the friends of Peace, which our Society, confining itself to efforts for the overthrow of War, is not constrained to determine.

Waiving, then, these matters, which have often thrown perplexity and difficulty over our cause, making many hesitate, I come now

* Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, Book VI. cap. 4.

to the precise object which we hope to accomplish, *the Abolition of the Institution of War, and of the whole War System, as an established Arbiter of Justice in the Commonwealth of Nations*. In the accurate statement of our aims, you will at once perceive the strength of our position. Much is always gained by a clear understanding of the question in issue; and the cause of Peace unquestionably suffers often, because it is misrepresented, or not fully comprehended. In the hope of removing this difficulty, I shall *first* unfold the true character of War and of the War System, involving the question of Preparations for War, and the question of a Militia. The way will then be open, in the *second* branch of this Address, for a consideration of the means by which this System can be overthrown. And here I shall pass in review the tendencies and examples of nations, and the efforts of individuals, constituting the Peace Movement, with the auguries of its triumph, briefly touching, at the close, on our duties to this great cause, and on the vanity of Military Glory.

1. And, first of War and the War System in the Commonwealth of Nations. By the Commonwealth of Nations I understand the Fraternity of Christian States, which recognizes a Common Law regulating their relations with each other, usually called the Law of Nations. This law, being established by the consent of nations, is not necessarily the law of all nations, but only of such as recognize it. The Europeans and the Orientals often differ with regard to its provisions; nor would it be proper to say that the Ottomans, or the Mahomedans in general, or the Chinese, had ever become parties to it. The substantial elements of this law are drawn from the law of nature, from the truths of Christianity, from the usages of nations, from the opinions of jurists and publicists, and from the written texts or enactments of treaties. Thus, in its origin and growth, it is not unlike the various systems of municipal jurisprudence, all of which may be referred to kindred sources.

It is often said, by way of excuse for the allowance of war, that nations are independent, and acknowledge no *common superior*. It is true, indeed, that they are politically independent, and acknowledge no common political sovereign. But they acknowledge a common superior of unquestioned influence and authority, whose rules they cannot disobey. This acknowledged common superior is the

Law of Nations. It were superfluous to dwell at length upon the opinions of publicists and jurists in confirmation of this view. "The Law of Nations," says Vattel,* a classic in this department, is "not less *obligatory* with respect to states, or to men united in political society, than to individuals." An eminent English authority, Lord Stowell, † says, "The *Conventional Law of Mankind*, which is evidenced in their practice, *allows* some and *prohibits* other modes of destruction." A recent German jurist ‡ says, "A nation associating itself with the general society of nations, *thereby recognizes a law common to all nations*, by which its international relations are to be regulated." Lastly, a popular English moralist, whom I have already quoted, and to whom I refer because his name is so familiar, Dr. Paley, § says, that the principal part of what is called the Law of Nations derives its obligatory character "*simply from the fact of its being established, and the general duty of conforming to established rules* upon questions, and between parties, where nothing but *positive regulations* can prevent difficulties, and where disputes are followed by such destructive consequences."

The Law of Nations is, then, the Supreme Law of the Commonwealth of Christian States, governing their relations with each other, determining their reciprocal rights, and sanctioning the remedies for the violation of these rights. To the Commonwealth of Nations, this Law is what the Constitution and Municipal Law of Massachusetts are to the associate towns and counties, composing this State, or rather, by an apter illustration, what the Federal Constitution of our Union is to the thirty sovereign States, which now recognize it as the supreme law.

But the Law of Nations — and I now come to a point of great importance in the clear understanding of the subject — while anticipating and providing for controversies between nations, recognizes and establishes War as the final Arbiter of these controversies. It distinctly says to the nations, "If you cannot agree together, then stake your cause upon the *Trial by Battle*." And it proceeds to define, at no inconsiderable length, under the name of Laws of War, the rules and regulations of this combat. "The Laws of

* Law of Nations, Preface.

† Robinson's Rep. Vol. I. p. 140.

‡ Heffter, quoted in Wheaton's Elements, Part I. cap. 1, § 7.

§ Philosophy, Book VI. cap. 12.

War," says Dr. Paley, "are part of the Law of Nations, and founded, as to their authority, upon the same principle with the rest of that code, namely, upon the fact of their being *established*, no matter when or by whom."

It is not uncommon to speak of the *practice* of War, or the *custom* of War, a term adopted by that devoted friend of our cause, the late Noah Worcester. Its apologists and expounders have called it a "judicial trial" — "one of the highest trials of right" — "a process of justice" — "a prosecution of our rights by force" — "a mode of condign punishment" — "an appeal for justice" — "a mode of obtaining rights." I prefer to characterize it as an INSTITUTION, established by the Commonwealth of Nations, as an Arbiter of Justice. As Slavery is an Institution, growing out of local custom, sanctioned, defined and established by the municipal law, so War is an Institution, growing out of general custom, sanctioned, defined and established by the Law of Nations.

It is only when we contemplate War in this light, that we are fully able to perceive its combined folly and wickedness. Let me bring this yet further home to your minds. Boston and Cambridge are adjoining towns, separated by the river Charles. In the event of controversies between these different jurisdictions, the municipal law has established a judicial tribunal, and not War, as the Arbiter. And, ascending the scale, in the event of controversies between two different counties, as between Essex and Middlesex, the same municipal law has established a judicial tribunal, and not War, as the Arbiter. And, ascending yet higher in the scale, in the event of controversies between two different sovereign States of our Union, the Federal Constitution has established a judicial tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States, and not War, as the Arbiter. But now mark; at the next stage the Arbiter is changed. In the event of controversies between two different States of the Commonwealth of Nations, the Supreme Law has established, not a judicial tribunal, but War, as the Arbiter. War is the Institution *established* for the determination of justice between the nations.

But the provisions of the municipal law of Massachusetts, and of the Federal Constitution, are not vain words. It is well known to all familiar with our courts, that suits between towns, and also between counties, are often entertained and satisfactorily adjudicated. The records of the Supreme Court of the United States show also that Sovereign States habitually refer important controversies to

this tribunal. There is now pending before this high court, an action of the State of Missouri *against* the State of Iowa, arising out of a question of boundary, wherein the former State claims a section of territory — larger than many German principalities — extending the whole length of the Northern border of Missouri, and several miles in breadth, and containing upward of two thousand square miles. And within a short period, this same tribunal has decided a similar question, between our own State of Massachusetts and our neighbor Rhode Island; the latter State pertinaciously claiming a section of territory, about three miles broad, on a portion of our southern frontier.

Suppose that in these different cases between towns, counties, States, War had been *established* by the supreme law as the Arbiter; imagine the disastrous consequences which must have ensued; picture the imperfect justice which must have been the end and fruit of such a contest; and while rejoicing that we are happily relieved, in these cases, from an alternative so dismal and deplorable, do not forget, that, on a larger theatre, where grander interests are staked, in the relations between nations, under the solemn sanction of the Law of Nations, War is *established* as the Arbiter of Justice. Do not forget that a complex and subtle code — the Laws of War — has been established to regulate the resort to this Arbiter.

Recognizing the irrational and unchristian character of War, as an established Arbiter between towns, counties and States, in our happy land, we may learn to condemn it as an established Arbiter between nations. But history furnishes a parallel, by which we may form a yet clearer idea of its true nature. I refer to the system of *Private Wars*, or, more properly, of *Petty Wars*, and to the *Trial by Battle*, which darkened the dark ages. Both of these, though differing in some respects, concurred in recognizing the sword as the Arbiter of Justice. The *right to wage war* (*le droit de guerroyer*) was accorded by the early municipal law of European States, particularly of the Continent, to all independent chiefs, however petty, but not to their vassals; precisely as the *right to wage war* is now accorded by international law to all independent states and principalities, however petty, but not to their subjects. Nay; it was often mentioned expressly among the “liberties” to which independent chiefs were entitled; as it is still recognized by international law among the “liberties” of independent states. But in proportion as the sovereignty of these chiefs was absorbed

in some larger lordship, this offensive *right* or “liberty” gradually disappeared. It continued to prevail extensively in France, till at last king John, by an ordinance dated 1361, expressly forbade Petty Wars throughout his kingdom, saying, “We order that all challenges and wars, and acts of violence against all persons, in any part whatever of our kingdom, shall in future cease, and also all assemblies, convocations and cavalcades of men at arms or archers, and also all pillages, seizures of goods and persons without right, *vengeances and counter vengeances* — all these things we wish to forbid, under pain of incurring our indignation, and of being reputed and held disobedient and rebel.”* It was reserved for Louis XI., as late as 1451, to make still another effort in the same direction, by expressly abrogating one of the “liberties” of Dauphiny, which secured to the inhabitants of this province the *right of war*. From these royal ordinances the Commonwealth of Nations might borrow more properly, words, in abrogating forever the Public Wars, or appropriate the Grand Wars, with their *vengeances and counter-vengeances*, which are yet sanctioned by international law among the “liberties” of Christian States.

At a later day, effective efforts were made in Germany against the same prevailing evil. Contests here were not always confined to feudal chiefs. Associations of tradesmen and of domestics sent defiances to each other, and even to whole cities, on pretences trivial as those which have sometimes been the occasions of the Grand Wars of Nations. There still remain to us *Declarations of War* by a lord of Prauenstein against the free city of Frankfort, because a young lady of the city refused to dance with his uncle; by the baker and other domestics of the Margrave of Baden, against Esslingen, Reutlingen, and other imperial cities; by the baker of the Count Palatine Louis against the cities of Augsburg, Ulm, and Rothwell; by the shoe-blacks of the University of Leipzig against the provost and other members; and, in 1477, by the cook of Eppenstein, with his scullions, dairy-maids and dish-washers, against Otho, Count of Solms. Finally, at the Diet of Worms, one of the most memorable in German annals, the Emperor Maximilian sanctioned an ordinance, which proclaimed a permanent Peace throughout Germany, abolished the *right* or “liberty” of Private

*Cauchy, du Duel considéré dans ses Origines, Tom. I. ch. v. p. 91.

War, and instituted a Supreme Tribunal, under the ancient name of the Imperial Chamber, to which recourse might be had, even by nobles, princes, and states, for the determination of their disputes, without appeal to the sword.*

But the Trial by Battle, or judicial combat, furnishes the most vivid picture of the Arbitrament of War. At one period, particularly in France, this was the universal umpire in disputes between private individuals. All causes, civil and criminal, with all the questions incident thereto, were referred to this Arbitrament. Neither bodily infirmity, nor old age, could exempt a litigant from the hazards of the Battle, even to determine matters of the most trivial character. Substitutes were at last allowed, and, as in War, bravos or champions were hired for wages to enter the lists. The proceedings were conducted gravely, according to prescribed forms, which were digested into a system of peculiar subtlety and minuteness; as War in our day has its established code, the Laws of War. Thus do violence, lawlessness and absurdity, shelter themselves beneath the Rule of Law! Religion also lent her sacred sanctions. The priest, with prayer and encouragement, cheered the insensate combatant, and, like the military chaplain of our day, appealed for aid to Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace.

To the honor of the Church, however, let me say, it early perceived the wickedness of this system. By the voices of pious bishops, by the ordinances of solemn councils, by the anathemas of Popes, it condemned† whomsoever should slay another in a battle, so impious and inimical to Christian peace, as “a most wicked homicide and bloody robber;” while it regarded the unhappy victim as a volunteer, guilty of his own death, and therefore decreed his remains to an unhonored burial without psalm or prayer. With sacerdotal supplications it vainly sought from rulers, and especially from successive emperors, to withdraw their countenance from this great evil, and with the civil power to confirm the ecclesiastical censures. Let praise and gratitude be offered to these just efforts! But alas! authentic history and the forms, still on record in the

*Cox's History of the House of Austria, cap. 19 & 21.

†Statuimus juxta antiquum ecclesiasticæ observationis morem, ut quicumque tam impia et Christianæ paci inimica pugna alterum occiderit seu vulneribus debilem reddiderit, *velut homicida nequissimus et latro cruentus* ab Ecclesiæ et omnium fidelium cœtu reddatur separatus, etc. (Canon. 13 Concil. Valent.) Cauchy, du Duel, Tom. I. ch. iii. p. 43.

ancient missals, attest the unhappy countenance which the Trial by Battle succeeded in obtaining too often even at the hands of the Church — as in our day the Liturgy of the English Church, and the conduct of Christian ministers in all countries, attest the unhappy countenance which the Institution of War yet receives. But the admonitions of the Church, and the efforts of good men slowly prevailed. Proofs by witnesses and by titles were gradually adopted, though opposed by the selfishness of the servants of the camp, of the subaltern officers, and of the lords, greedy of the fees, or wages of the combat. In England, Trial by Battle was attacked by Henry II., striving to substitute the trial by jury. In France, it was expressly forbidden, in an immortal ordinance, by that illustrious monarch, St. Louis. At last, this system, so wasteful of life, so barbarous in character, so vain and inefficient as an Arbiter of Justice, yielded to the establishment of judicial tribunals.

An early king of the Lombards, in formal decree, condemned the Trial by Battle as “impious;” Montesquieu at a later time branded it as “monstrous;” and Sir William Blackstone, a writer of authority on the English law, characterized it as “clearly an unchristian, as well as most uncertain method of trial.” In the light of our day all unite in this condemnation. No man hesitates. No man undertakes its apology; nor does any man count as “glory” the feats of arms which it prompted and displayed. But the laws of morals are general and not special. They apply to communities and nations as well as to individuals; nor is it possible, by any cunning or of logic, by any device of human wit, to distinguish between that domestic Institution, the Trial by Battle, *established* by municipal law as the Arbiter between individuals, and that international Institution, the grander Trial by Battle, *established* by the Christian Commonwealth as the Arbiter between nations. If the judicial combat was impious, monstrous and unchristian, then is War impious, monstrous and unchristian. And so it is regarded by our Society.

Let us look further at the true character of the Institution of War. It has been pointedly said in England, that the whole object of King, Lords and Commons, and of the complex British Constitution, is “to get twelve men into a jury-box;” and Mr. Hume repeats the idea when he declares that the *administration of justice* is the grand aim of government. If this be true of individual nations

in their municipal affairs, it is equally true of the Commonwealth of Nations. The whole complex System of the Law of Nations, over-arching all the Christian States, has but one distinct object, *the administration of justice* between nations. Would that with pen or tongue I could adequately expose the enormity of this system, involving, as it does, a violation of the precepts of religion, of the dictates of common sense, of the suggestions of economy, and of the most precious sympathies of humanity! Would that now, to all who hear me, I could impart something of the strength of my own convictions!

I need not dwell on the waste and cruelty thus authorized. These stare us wildly in the face, wherever we turn, as we travel the page of history. We see the desolation and death that pursue War's demoniac footsteps. We look upon sacked towns, upon ravaged territories, upon violated homes; we behold all the sweet charities of life changed to wormwood and gall. The soul is penetrated by the sharp moan of mothers, sisters and daughters — of fathers, brothers and sons, who, in the bitterness of bereavement, refused to be comforted. Our eyes rest at last upon one of those fair fields, where nature, in her abundance, spreads her cloth of gold, spacious and apt for the entertainment of mighty multitudes — or, perhaps, from the curious subtlety of its position, like the carpet in the Arabian tale, seeming to contract for the accommodation of a few only, or to dilate so as to receive an innumerable host. Here, under a bright sun, such as shone at Austerlitz or Buena Vista — amidst the peaceful harmonies of nature — on the Sabbath of Peace — we behold bands of brothers, children of a common Father, heirs to a common happiness, struggling together in the deadly fight; with the madness of fallen spirits seeking with murderous weapons the lives of brothers who have never injured them or their kindred. The havoc rages. The ground is soaked with their commingling blood. The air is rent by their commingling cries. Horse and rider are stretched together on the earth. More revolting than the mangled victims, than the gashed limbs, than the lifeless trunks, than the spattering brains, are the lawless passions which sweep, tempest-like, through the fiendish tumult.

Nearer comes the storm and nearer, rolling fast and frightful on.
Speak, Ximena, speak and tell us, who has lost, and who has won?
"Alas! alas! I know not; friend and foe together fall,
O'er the dying rush the living; pray, my sister, for them all!"

Horror-struck, we ask wherefore this hateful contest? The melancholy, but truthful answer comes, that this is the *established* method of determining justice between nations!

The scene changes. Far away on the distant pathway of the ocean two ships approach each other, with white canvas broadly spread to receive the flying gales. They are proudly built. All of human art has been lavished in their graceful proportions, and well-compacted sides, while they look in dimensions like floating happy islands of the sea. A numerous crew, with costly appliances of comfort, hives in their secure shelter. Surely these two travellers shall meet in joy and friendship; the flag at the mast-head shall give the signal of fellowship; the delighted sailors shall cluster in the rigging, and even on the yard-arms, to look each other in the face, while the exhilarating voices of both crews shall mingle in accents of gladness uncontrollable. Alas! alas! it is not so. Not as brothers, not as friends, not as wayfarers of the common ocean, do they come together; but as enemies. The gentle vessels now bristle fiercely with death-dealing instruments. On their spacious decks, aloft on all their masts, flashes the deadly musketry. From their sides spout cataracts of flame, amidst the pealing thunders of a fatal artillery. They, who had escaped "the dreadful touch of merchant-marring rocks;" who on their long and solitary way had sped unharmed by wind or wave; whom the hurricane had spared; in whose favor storms and seas had intermitted their immitigable war; now at last fall by the hand of each other. The same spectacle of horror greets us from both ships. On their decks, reddened with blood, the murders of St. Bartholomew and of the Sicilian Vespers, with the fires of Smithfield, seem to break forth anew and to concentrate their rage. Each has now become a swimming Golgotha. At length these vessels—such pageants of the sea—once so stately—so proudly built—but now rudely shattered by cannon-balls—with shivered masts and ragged sails—exist only as unmanageable wrecks, weltering on the uncertain waves, whose temporary lull of peace is their only safety. In amazement at this strange, unnatural contest—away from country and home—where there is no country or home to defend—we ask again, wherefore this dismal duel? Again the melancholy, but truthful answer promptly comes, that this is the *established* method of determining justice between nations.

Yes ! the barbarous brutal relations which once prevailed between individuals, which prevailed still longer between the communities, principalities and provinces composing nations, are not yet banished from the great Christian Commonwealth. Religion, reason, humanity, first penetrate the individual, next small communities, and, widening in their influence, slowly leaven the nations. Thus while we condemn the bloody contests of individuals, of towns, of counties, of provinces, of principalities, and deny to them the *right of waging war*, or of appeal to the *Trial by Battle*, we continue to uphold an atrocious System of folly and crime, which is to nations, what the System of Petty Wars was to principalities and provinces, what the Duel was to individuals ; for *War is the Duel of Nations*.* As from Pluto's throne flowed those terrible rivers, Styx, Acheron, Cocytus and Phlegethon, with their lamenting waters and currents of flame, so from this established System flow the direful currents of War. "Ours is a damnable profession," is the recent confession of a veteran British general. "War is a trade of barbarians," exclaimed Napoleon, in a moment of truthful remorse, prompted by his bloodiest field. "Give them Hell," was the language written on a slate by a speechless, dying American officer. Alas ! these words are not too strong. The business of War cannot be other than a damnable profession—a trade of barbarians ; and War itself is certainly Hell on earth. But consider well—do not forget—let the idea sink deep into your souls, animating you to constant endeavors—that this damnable profession, that this trade of barbarians, is a part of the War System, which is sanctioned by International Law, and that War itself is Hell, recognized, legalized, established, organized by the Commonwealth of Nations !

"Put together," says Voltaire, "all the vices of all the ages and places, and they will not come up to the mischiefs of one campaign." This is a strong speech. Another of surer truth might be made.

*Plautus speaks, in the *Epidicus*, of one who had obtained great riches by the *duelling art*, meaning the art of War :

—————*Arte duellica*

Divitias magnas adeptum.

And Horace, in his Odes (Lib. iv. 15) hails the age of Augustus, as at peace or free from Duels, and with the temple of Janus closed :

. . . Tua, Cæsar, ætas
 . . . vacuum duellis
 Jovem Quirini clausit.

Put together all the ills and calamities from the visitations of God, from convulsions of nature, from pestilence and famine, and they shall not equal the ills and calamities inflicted by man upon his brother-man, through the visitation of War — while alas ! the sufferings of War are without the alleviation of those gentle virtues which ever attend the involuntary misfortunes of the race. Where the horse of Attila had been, a blade of grass would not grow ; but in the footprints of pestilence, of famine, and the earthquake, the kindly charities have sprung into life.

The last hundred years have witnessed three peculiar visitations of God ; first, the earthquake at Lisbon ; next, the Asiatic Cholera, as it moved slowly and ghastly, with its scythe of death, from the Delta of the Ganges, over Bengal, Persia, Arabia, Syria, Russia, till Europe and America shuddered before the spectral reaper ; and, lastly, the recent famine in Ireland, consuming, with remorseless rage, the population of that ill-fated land. It is impossible to estimate precisely the deadly work of the Cholera or of famine, or to picture the miseries which they caused. But the single brief event of the earthquake can be portrayed in authentic colors.

Lisbon, whose ancient origin is referred by fable to the wanderings of Ulysses, was one of the fairest cities of Europe. From the summit of seven hills, it looked down upon the sea, and the bay studded with cheerful villages — upon the broad Tagus, expanding into a harbor ample for all the navies of Europe, and upon a country of rare beauty, smiling with the olive and the orange, amidst the grateful shadows of the cypress and the elm. A climate, which offered flowers in winter, enhanced these peculiar advantages of position ; and a numerous population thronged its narrow and irregular streets. Its forty churches, its palaces, its public edifices, its warehouses, its convents, its fortresses, its citadel, had become a boast. Not by War, not by the hand of man, were these solid structures levelled, and all these delights changed to desolation.

Lisbon, on the morning of November 1st, 1755, was taken and sacked by an earthquake. The spacious warehouses were destroyed ; the lordly edifices, the massive convents, the impregnable fortresses, with the lofty citadel, were toppled to the ground ; and as the affrighted people sought shelter in the churches, they were crushed beneath the falling ruins. Twenty thousand persons perished in this catastrophe. Fire and robbery mingled with the earthquake, and

this beautiful city seemed to be obliterated. The powers of Europe were touched by this great misfortune, and succor from all sides was soon offered to repair the loss. Within three months English vessels appeared in the Tagus loaded with generous contributions — £20,000 in gold — a similar sum in silver — six thousand barrels of salt meat, four thousand barrels of butter, one thousand bags of biscuit, twelve hundred barrels of rice, ten thousand quintals of corn, besides hats, stockings and shoes.

Such was the desolation, and such the charity sown by the earthquake at Lisbon — an event, which, after the lapse of nearly a century, still stands without a parallel. But War shakes from its terrible folds all this desolation, without its attendant charity. Nay, more; the Commonwealth of Nations *voluntarily agrees, each with the other*, under the grave sanctions of International Law, to invoke this desolation, in the settlement of controversies among its members, while it expressly enjoins upon all its members, not already parties to the controversy, to abstain from rendering succor to the unhappy victim. High tribunals are established, whose special duty it is to uphold this Arbitrament, and, with unrelenting severity, to enforce these barbarous injunctions, to the end that no aid, no charity, shall come to revive the sufferer, or to alleviate the calamity. Vera Cruz has been bombarded and wasted by the American arms. Its citadel, its churches, its houses have been shattered, and peaceful families at their firesides have been torn in mutilated fragments by the murderous, bursting shell; but the universal English charities, which helped restore Lisbon, were not offered to the ruined Mexican city. They could not have been offered, without a violation of the *Laws of War!*

It is because men have thus far seen War chiefly in the light of their prejudices, regarding it only as an agency of attack or defence, or as a desperate sally of wickedness, that it becomes difficult to recognize it as a form of judgment, sanctioned and *legalized* by Public Authority. Let us learn to regard it in its true character, as an *establishment* of the Commonwealth of Nations, and one of the “liberties” of independent states; and it will no longer seem merely an expression of the lawless passions of men; no longer a necessary incident of imperfect human nature; no longer an unavoidable, uncontrollable volcanic eruption of rage, of *vengeances and counter-vengeances*, knowing no bounds; but it will be recognized as a

monstrous and gigantic Institution for the adjudication of international rights, — as if it was established that an earthquake, with its uncounted woes, and without its attendant charities, might be legally invoked as the Arbiter of Justice.

All must unite in condemning the Arbitrament of War. Does any one hesitate? He who runs may read and comprehend its enormity. But if War be thus odious; if it be the Duel of Nations; if it be the yet surviving Trial by Battle; then it must affect with its barbarism all its incidents, all its enginery and machinery, all who sanction it, all who have any part or lot in it; in fine, the whole vast System by which it is upheld. It is impossible, by any discrimination, to separate the component parts of this System. We must regard it as a whole, in its entirety. But half our work would be done, if we confined ourselves to a condemnation of this Institution merely. We condemn also all its instruments and agencies, all its adjuncts and accessories, all its furniture and equipage, all its armaments and operations; the whole apparatus of forts, of navies, of armies, of military display, of military chaplains, and of military sermons; all together constituting, in connection with the Institution of War, what may be called the WAR SYSTEM. It is this which we seek to abolish; believing that religion, humanity and policy all require the establishment of some peaceful means for the administration of international justice, and that they still further require *the general disarming of the Christian nations*, to the end that the enormous expenditures now lavished upon the War System may be applied to purposes of usefulness and beneficence, and that the *business* of the soldier may finally cease.

While earnestly professing this object, let me again disclaim all idea of questioning the right of strict self-defence, or the duty of upholding government, and of maintaining the supremacy of the law, whether on the land, or on the sea. Reluctantly admitting the necessity of Force, even for such purposes, *Christianity revolts at Force as a substitute for a judicial tribunal*. The example of the great Teacher, the practice of the early disciples, the injunctions of self-denial, of love, of non-resistance to evil — which are sometimes supposed to forbid the resort to Force in any exigency, even in self-defence, — all these must apply with unquestionable certainty to the established System of War. *Here, at least, there can be no doubt*. If, sorrowfully, necessarily, cautiously — in a yet barbarous age — the sword,

in the hand of an assaulted individual, may become the instrument of sincere self-defence ; if, under the sanctions of a judicial tribunal, it may become the instrument of Justice also ; *surely it can never be the Arbiter of Justice.* Here is a distinction vital to our cause, and never to be forgotten in presenting its Christian claims. The sword of the magistrate is unlike — oh ! how unlike — the flaming sword of War.

Let us now look briefly in detail, at some of the component parts of the War System. All of these may be resolved into PREPARATIONS FOR WAR, as court-house, jail, judges, sheriffs, constables and *posse comitatus* are *preparations* for the administration of municipal justice. If justice were not to be administered, these would not exist. If War were not sanctioned by the Commonwealth of Nations, as the means of determining international controversies, then forts, navies, armies, military display, military chaplains and military sermons would not exist. They would be as useless and irrational — except for the rare occasions of a police — as similar preparations would now be in Boston for defence against its neighbor Cambridge ; or in the County of Essex for defence against its neighbor County of Middlesex ; or in the State of Massachusetts for defence against its neighbors, Rhode Island and New York. It is only recently that men have learned to question the propriety and righteousness of these preparations ; for it is only recently that men have begun to open their eyes to the true character of the System, in which they are a part. *It will yet be seen that sustaining these we sustain the System.* Still further, it will yet be seen, that, sustaining these, we offend by wicked waste against the demands of economy, and violate also the most precious sentiments of Human Brotherhood ; taking counsel of distrust instead of love, and provoking to rivalry and enmity, instead of association and peace.

Time would fail me now to discuss adequately the nature of these preparations ; and I am the more willing to abridge what I am tempted to say, because on another occasion I have treated this part of the subject. I should do wrong, however, not to expose their downright inconsistency with the spirit of Christianity. It is from a clear comprehension of the unchristian character of the War System, that we shall perceive the unchristian character of the preparations which it encourages and requires. I might exhibit this character by an examination of the Laws of War, drawn originally from no celestial founts, but from a dark profound of Heathenism. This is

unnecessary. The Constitution of our own country furnishes an illustration so remarkable as to be a touchstone of the whole System. No town, county, or State has the "liberty" to "declare War." The exercise of any proper self-defence, arising from actual necessity, requires no such "liberty." But unhappily Congress is expressly authorized to "declare War" — that is to appeal to the Arbitrament of arms. And the Constitution proceeds to state that all, "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," shall be deemed "traitors." Mark now, what the Gospel has said: *Love your enemies; if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink.* Thus shall obedience to this positive injunction of Christianity, expose a person, under the War System, to the penalty of the highest crime known to the law. Can this be a Christien system?

But the true character of these preparations is distinctly, though unconsciously, attested by the names of the vessels in the British Navy. I select the following offensive catalogue from the latest official List. Most of these are steam-ships of recent construction. They may be considered, therefore, to represent the spirit of the British Navy in our day — nay, of those War Preparations, of which they are a most effective part:—Acheron, Adder, Alecto, Avenger, Basilisk, Blood-hound, Bull-dog, Crocodile, Erebus, Firebrand, Fury, Gladiator, Goliath, Gorgon, Harpy, Hecate, Hound, Jackal, Mastiff, Pluto, Rattlesnake, Revenge, Salamander, Savage, Scorpion, Scourge, Serpent, Spider, Spiteful, Spitfire, Styx, Sulphur, Tartar, Tartarus, Teazer, Terrible, Terror, Vengeance, Viper, Vixen, Virago, Volcano, Vulture, Warspite, Wildfire, Wolf, Wolverine!

Such is the Christian array of Victoria, Defender of the Faith! It may remind us of the Pagan swarm of savage warriors upon our own continent, led by Black Hawk, Man-Killer, and the Wild Bear; or of the companions of King John, in wicked depredations upon his subjects, at another period of English history, "Falco without Bowels," "Maclean the Bloody," "Walter Buch, the Murderer," "Sot-tim, the Merciless," and "Godeschal, the Iron-Hearted." Or it might seem to be

—all the grisly legions that troop
Under the sooty flag of Acheron.

As a man is known by the company he keeps — as a tree is known by its fruits, so shall the War System be fully and unequivocally known by these its chosen ministers, and by all the accursed fruits of War. Employing such representatives, sustained by such agen-

cies, animated by such Furies — and producing such fruits of tears and bitterness, it must be hateful to good men. Tell me not it is sanctioned by the religion of Christ; do not enrol the Saviour and his disciples in its Satanic squadron; do not invoke the Gospel of Peace, in profane vindication of an Institution, which, by its own too palpable confession, exists in defiance of all the most cherished Christian sentiments; do not dishonor the Divine Spirit of gentleness, of forbearance, of love, by supposing that it can ever enter into this System, except to change its whole nature and name, to cast out the devils which possess it, and fill its gigantic energies with the holy inspiration of Beneficence.

I need say little of military chaplains, or military sermons. Like the steamships of the navy, they come under the head of Preparations for War. They are unquestionably a part of the War System. They belong to the same school with the priests of former times, who held the picture of the Prince of Peace before the barbarous champion of the Duel, saying, "Sir Knight, behold here the remembrance of our Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, who willingly gave his most precious body to death in order to save us. Now, ask of him mercy, and pray that on this day he may be willing to aid you, if you have right, for he is the sovereign judge."* They belong to the same school with the English prelates of our day, who, in the name of the Prince of Peace, consecrate banners to be used in remote East Indian wars, saying, "Be thou in the midst of our hosts, as thou wast in the plains of India, and in the field of Waterloo, and may these banners, which we bless and consecrate this day, lead thee ever on to glorious victory." In thus consenting to degrade the "blesedness" of the Gospel to the "blasphemy" of the War System, they follow long established custom, doubtless often without considering the true character of the System, whose ministers they become. Their apology will be, that "they know not what they do."

And here the important practical question occurs, Is the *Militia* obnoxious to the same unequivocal condemnation? So far as the militia constitutes a part of the War System, it is impossible to distinguish it from the rest of the System. It is a portion of the apparatus provided for the administration of international justice. From this character it borrows the unwholesome attractions of War,

*Cauchy, Du Duel, Tom I. cap. III, p. 74.

while, like a North American Indian, it disports itself in finery and parade. Of the latter feature I will only incidentally speak. If War be a Christian Institution, let those, who act as its ministers, shroud themselves in colors congenial with their dreadful trade. Let them, with sorrow and solemnity, not with gladness and pomp, proceed to their melancholy office. The Jew, Shylock, speaking through the wisdom of Shakspeare, exposes the mockery of the street-shows of Venice in words which sometimes find an echo here :

———When you hear the drum,
And the vile squeaking of the wry-necked fife,
Clamber not up to the casements then,
Nor thrust your head into the public street,
To gaze on Christian fools with varnished faces ;
But stop my house's ears, I mean my casements ;
Let not the sound of shallow foppery enter
My sober house.

Not as a part of the War System, but only as an agent for preserving domestic peace, and for sustaining the law, can the militia be entitled to support. And here arises the important practical question — interesting to the opponents of the War System and to the lovers of order — whether the same object may not be accomplished by an agent, less expensive, less cumbersome, and less tardy, forming no part of the War System, and, therefore, in no respect liable to the objections encountered by the militia. Even the supporters of the militia do not disguise its growing unpopularity. The eminent Military Commissioners of Massachusetts, to whom, in 1847 was referred the duty of arranging a system for its organization and discipline, confess that there is “ either a defect of power in the State government for an efficient and salutary militia organization, or *the absence of a public sentiment in its favor*, and a consequent unwillingness to submit to the requirements of service, which alone can sustain it ; ” and they add, that “ they have been met, in the performance of their task, with information from all quarters, of its general neglect, and of the certain and rapid declension of the militia in numbers and efficiency. ” And the Adjutant General of Massachusetts, after alluding to the different systems which have been vainly tried, and have fallen into disuse, remarks, that “ the fate of each system is indicative of public sentiment, and until public sentiment changes, *no military system whatever can be sustained in the*

state.” Nor is this condition of public sentiment for the first time noticed. It was also recognized by the Commissioners, who, as long ago as 1839, were charged by the legislature with this subject. In their report they say, “It is enough to know that all attempts hitherto to uphold the system in its original design of organization, discipline and subordination, *are at last brought to an unsuccessful issue.*”

None, who are familiar with public opinion in our country and, particularly in Massachusetts, will question the accuracy of these official statements. It is true, that there is an indisposition on the part of citizens to assume the burthens of the militia. Still further, its offices and dignities have ceased to be an object of general regard. This certainly must be founded in a conviction, that it is no longer necessary or useful; for it is not customary with the people of Massachusetts to decline occasions of service, necessary or useful to the community. The interest which once attended military celebrations has decayed. Nor should the fact be concealed, that there are large numbers, whose sentiments on this subject are not of mere indifference; who regard with aversion the fanfaronade of a militia muster; who question not a little the influence which it exercises over those who take part in it, or even within it, and who look with regret upon the expenditure of money and time which the service requires.

If such be the condition of the public mind, it is wrong for the Government not to recognize it — that our legislation may be accommodated thereto. The soul of all effective laws is an animating public sentiment. This gives vitality to what else would be a dead letter. In vain do we enact what is not inspired by this spirit. No skill in the device of the system; no penalties; no bounties even; can uphold it. But happily we are not without remedy. If the State Legislatures should deem it proper to provide a substitute for this questionable or offensive agency, as a conservator of domestic quiet, it is entirely within their competency. Let the general voice demand the *substitute*.

Among the powers, recognized as reserved to the States, under the Federal Constitution, is the power of *Internal Police*. Within its territorial limits a State is sovereign. Its municipal arrangements depend entirely upon its own will. In the exercise of this will, let it establish a system, congenial with the sentiment of the

age, which shall supply the place of the militia, as a guardian of municipal quiet. This system may consist of unpaid volunteers or special constables, like the fire companies in the country, or of hired men, enrolled for this particular purpose, and always within call, like the fire companies in Boston. It would not be thought desirable, in all probability, that they should be clad in showy costume, or subjected to all the peculiarities of the military drill. I cannot doubt that a system so simple, practical, efficient, unostentatious, and cheap, especially as compared with the militia would be in entire harmony with the existing sentiment, while it could not fail to remedy those evils which are feared from the present neglect of the militia. Many unsuccessful attempts have been made to reform the militia. *It remains that a proper effort should be made to provide a substitute for it.*

An eminent English jurist, of the last century—renowned as a scholar also—Sir William Jones, in a learned and ingenious tract, entitled “An Inquiry into the Legal Mode of suppressing Riots, with a Constitutional Plan of Future Defence,” * after developing the obligations of the citizen, under the common law, as a part of the Power of the Country, has presented a system of organization which is to act independently of the military. It is not probable that this system would be acceptable, in all its details, to the people of our community; but there is one of his recommendations, which seems to harmonize with the existing sentiment. “Let the companies,” he says, “be taught in the most private and orderly manner for two or three hours early every morning, until they are completely skilled in the use of their arms; *let them not necessarily march through the streets or high roads, nor make any the least military parade, but consider themselves entirely as part of the civil State.*”

But, while divorcing the Police from the unchristian and barbarous War System, I would never fail to inculcate the vital importance of maintaining law and order. Life and property should be guarded. Peace must be preserved in our streets. And it is the duty of the Government to provide such means as shall be most expedient for this purpose, if those already established are found in any respect inadequate, or uncongenial with the Spirit of the Age.

I cannot close this exposition of the War System without a brief endeavor to display the inordinate expenditure by which it is sustain-

*Jones's Works, Vol. VI. p. 685.

ed. And here figures appear to lose their functions. They seem to pant, as they toil vainly to represent the enormous sums consumed in this unparelled waste. Our own experience, measured by the concerns of common life, does not allow us adequately to conceive these sums. Like the periods of geological time, or the distances of the fixed stars, they baffle the imagination. Look, for instance, at the cost of this System to the United States. Without making any allowance for the loss sustained by the withdrawal of active men from productive industry, we find that, from the adoption of the Federal Constitution down to 1848, there has been paid directly from the National Treasury—

For the Army and fortifications,	\$366,713,209
For the Navy and its operations,	\$209,994,428
	<hr/>
	\$576,707,687

This amount of itself is immense. But this is not all. Regarding the militia as a part of the War System, we must add a moderate estimate for its cost during this period, which, according to the calculations of an able and accurate economist, may be placed at \$1,500,000,000. The whole presents an inconceivable sum-total of *more than two thousand millions* of dollars, which have been dedicated by our Government to the support of the War System—more than *seven* times as much as was set apart by the Government, during the same period, to all other purposes whatsoever!

Look now at the Commonwealth of European States. I do not intend to speak of the War Debts, under whose accumulated weight these States are now pressed to the earth. These are the terrible legacy of the Past. I refer directly to the existing War System, the establishment of the Present. According to recent calculations, its annual cost is not less than a *thousand million* of dollars. Endeavor for a moment, by a comparison with other interests, to grapple with this sum.

It is larger than the entire profit of all the commerce and manufactures of the world.

It is larger than all the expenditure for agricultural labor, for the production of food for man, upon the whole face of the globe.

It is larger, by a hundred million, than the amount of all the exports of all the nations of the earth.

It is larger, by more than five hundred million, than the value of all the shipping of the civilized world.

It is larger, by nine hundred and ninty-seven million, than the annual combined charities of Europe and America for preaching the Gospel to the Heathen.

Yes! the Commonwealth of Christian States, including our own country, appropriates, without hesitation, as a matter of course, upwards of a thousand million of dollars annually to the maintenance of the War System, and vaunts its two millions of dollars, laboriously collected, for diffusing the light of the Gospel in foreign lands! With untold prodigality of cost it perpetuates the worst Heathenism of War, while, by charities insignificant in comparison, it doles to the Heathen the message of Peace. At home it breeds and fattens a cloud of eagles and vultures, trained to swoop upon the land; to all the Gentiles across the sea it dismisses a solitary dove.

Still further; every ship of war that floats costs more than a well endowed college.

Every sloop of war that floats costs more than the largest public library in our country.

But it is sometimes said, by persons yet in the leading-strings of inherited prejudice, and with little appreciation of the true safety found in the principles of Peace, that all these comprehensive preparations are needed for the protection of the country against enemies from abroad. Wishing to present our cause, without raising any superfluous question as to what have been called "defensive wars," on which there are varieties of opinions among the opponents of War, let me say in reply—and *here all can unite*—that if these preparations should be so needed at any time, according to the aggressive martial interpretation of the right of self-defence, there is much reason to believe it would be, because the unchristian spirit in which they have their birth, and which lowers and scowls in the very names of the ships, had provoked the danger; as the presence of a bravo in our houses might challenge the attack he was hired to resist. Frederick of Prussia, sometimes called the Great — with an honesty or impudence unparalleled in the history of warriors — has left on record, most instructively prominent among the real reasons which urged him to make war upon Maria Theresa, *that he had troops always ready to act*. Thus did these *preparations* for War become, as they have to often shown themselves, the *incentives* to War. A careful consideration of human nature, as manifest in the

conduct of individuals or of communities, will show that the fatal War Spirit derives much of its aliment from these preparations. Indeed they sow the seeds of the evil, which, it is sometimes vainly supposed, they help to avert. Let it never be forgotten — let it be treasured as a solemn warning of history — that it was the possession of *troops always ready to act*, that served to inspire that succession of bloody wars, which, first pouncing upon Silesia, at last mingled with the strifes of England and France, and, even in the distant colonies across the Atlantic, ranged the savages of the forest under hostile European banners.

But I deny, distinctly, that these preparations are needed for any just self-defence. In the first place, it is difficult, if not impossible, to suppose any such occasion, in the Fraternity of Christian States, if War should cease to be an established Arbitrament or if any State should be so truly great as to decline its umpirage. There is no such occasion among the towns, or counties, or states, of our extended country. There is no such occasion among the counties of Great Britain, or among the provinces of France. But the same sentiments of good will and fellowship, the same ties of commerce which unite towns, counties, states and provinces, are fast drawing into similar communion the whole Commonwealth of Nations. France and England, so long regarded as natural enemies, are now better known to each other, than, only a short time ago, were different provinces of the former kingdom. And at the present moment, there is a closer intimacy in business and social intercourse, between Great Britain and our own country, than there was at the beginning of the present century, between Massachusetts and Virginia.

But admitting that an enemy might approach our shores, with purposes of piracy, or plunder, or conquest, who can doubt that the surest protection would be found—not in the insane waste of previous preparations—not in the idle fortresses along our coasts, built at a cost far surpassing all our light-houses, and all our colleges—but in the intelligence, union, and pacific repose of good men, with the unbounded resources derived from an uninterrupted devotion to productive industry? I think it may be assumed as beyond question, in the present light of political economy, that the people who have spent most sparingly in preparations for War — all other things being equal — must possess the most enduring means of actual self-defence at home, on their own soil, before their own hearths — if any such melancholy alternative should occur. Consider the prodigious sums,

exceeding in all two thousand million of dollars, squandered by the United States, since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, in support of the War System. Surely, if these means had been devoted to railroads and canals, to schools and colleges, our country would possess, at the present moment, an accumulated material power grander far than any she now boasts. But there is another power of more unfailing temper, which would also be hers. Overflowing with intelligence, with charity, with civilization, with all that constitutes a generous state, she would be able to win peaceful triumphs transcending all she has yet achieved — surrounding the land with an invincible self-defensive might, and, in their unfading brightness, rendering all glory from War impossible. Well does the poet say, with most persuasive truth,

What constitutes a State ?
Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate ;
 Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned ;
 Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride ;
 But MEN, high-minded MEN.

Such men will possess a Christian greatness, rendering them unable to do an injury to a neighbor ; while their character, instinct with all the guardian virtues, must render their neighbors unable to do an injury to them ; and there can be none to molest them or make them afraid.

The injunction, “ In time of Peace prepare for War,” is of Heathen origin. As a rule of international conduct, it is unworthy of an age of Christian light. It can be vindicated only on two grounds. First, by assuming that the Arbitrament of War is the proper agency for deciding controversies between nations, and that the War System is, therefore, to be maintained and strengthened,—as the essential means of international justice. Or, secondly, by assuming the rejected dogma of an Atheist philosopher, Hobbes, that war is the natural state of man. Whatever may be the infirmities of our passions, all must perceive that the natural state of individuals, in which they have the highest happiness, and to which they tend by an irresistible heavenly attraction, is Peace. And this is true of communities and of nations, as well as of individuals. The proper rule should be, “ In time of Peace cultivate the arts of Peace.” So doing, you will render the country truly strong and truly great ;

not by arousing the passions of War; not by nursing men to the business of blood; not by converting the land into a flaming arsenal, a magazine of gunpowder, or an "infernal machine," all ready to explode; but by dedicating its whole energies to productive and beneficent works.

The incongruity of this System of Armed Peace may be illustrated by an example. Look into the life of that illustrious philosopher, John Locke, and you will find that, in the journal of his tour through France, describing the arches of the amphitheatre at Nismes, he says, "there is a stone laid about twenty inches or two feet square, and about six times the length of *my sword, which was about a philosophic yard long.*" Who is not struck with the incongruity and unseemliness of the exhibition, as he sees the author of the Essay on the Human Understanding, travelling with a sword by his side? But in this he only followed the barbarous custom of his time. Individuals then lived in the same relations toward each other, which now characterize nations. The War System had not yet entirely retreated from municipal law and custom, to find its last citadel and temple in the laws and customs of nations. Do not forget that, at the present moment, our own country, the great Author, among the nations, of a new Essay on the Human Understanding, not only travels with a sword by its side, but lives encased in complete armor, burthensome to its limbs, and costly to its treasury.

In condemning the War System, as a barbarous and most wasteful agency, the token and relic of a state of society alien to Christian civilization, we may except the navy, so far as it is necessary in the arrest of pirates, of traffickers in human flesh, and generally in preserving the police of the sea. But after the present survey, it will be difficult for the unprejudiced mind to regard the array of fortifications and of standing armies, otherwise than as obnoxious to the condemnation which attaches to the War System. The fortifications are the instruments, and the armies are the hired champions, of the great Duel of Nations.

But here I quit this part of the subject. Sufficient has been said to expose the true character of the War System of the Commonwealth of Christian Nations. It stands before us as a colossal image of International Justice, *with the sword, but without the scales*; like a hideous Mexican idol, besmeared with human blood, and surrounded by the sickening stench of human sacrifice. But this im-

age, which seems to span the continents, while it rears aloft its flashing form of brass and of gold, and far in the clouds hides "the top and round of sovereignty" which it wears upon its head, can yet be laid low; for its feet are of clay. Every thing which exists in violation of right and reason, of religion and humanity, is weak and brittle. And such is the condition of the War System. It stands on wrong and folly, on impiety and inhumanity. Surely, its feet are of clay.

II. And now I come, in the second branch of this Address, to the more grateful consideration of the means by which the War System can be overthrown. Here I shall unfold the tendencies and examples of nations, and the sacred efforts of individuals, constituting the Peace Movement, now ready to triumph, and shall offer some practical suggestions on our duties to this great cause, with a concluding glance at the barbarism of Military Glory. In this review I shall not be able to avoid the details incident to a multiplicity of topics; but I shall try to introduce nothing that does not bear directly on the subject.

Civilization now writhes in great travail and torment, and asks for liberation from the oppressive sway of the War System. Like a slave, under a weary weight of chains, it raises its exhausted arms, and pleads for the angel Deliverer. And lo! the beneficent angel comes; not like the Grecian God of Day, with vengeful arrow to slay the destructive Python; not like the Archangel Michael, with potent spear to transfix Satan to the earth, but with words of gentleness and Christian cheer, saying to all nations, and to all children of men, "Ye are all brothers, of *one* flesh, of *one* fold, of *one* shepherd, children of *one* Father, heirs to *one* happiness. By your own energies, by united fraternal endeavors, in the name of Christ, shall the tyranny of War be overthrown, and its Juggernaut be crushed to the earth."

In this spirit, and with this encouragement, we should labor for that grand and final object, the watchword of all ages, the Unity of the Human Family. Not in benevolence, but in selfishness, has this been sought in times past; not to promote the happiness of all, but to establish the dominion of one. It was the mad lust for power which carried Alexander from conquest to conquest, till he boasted that the whole world was one empire, of which his Macedonian pha-

lanx was the citadel. Again, the same passion animated Rome, till, at last, while Christ lay in his manger, this city swayed broader lands than had been ruled by Alexander. The Gospel, in its simple narrative, says, "And it came, to pass about these times, that a decree went out from Cæsar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." History points to the exile of Ovid, who, falling under the displeasure of the same Emperor, was condemned to close his days in vain longings for Rome, far away in Pontus, beyond the Euxine Sea. With singular significance, these two contemporaneous incidents reveal the universality of Roman dominion, stretching from Britain to Parthia. But this empire crumbled, to be re-constructed for a brief moment, in part by Charlemagne, in part by Tamerlane. In our own age, Napoleon made a last effort for Unity, founded on Force. And now, from his utterances at St. Helena, the expressed wisdom of his unparalleled experience, comes the remarkable confession, worthy of constant memory, "The more I study the world, the more am I convinced of the inability of brute force to create any thing durable." From the sepulchre of Napoleon, now sleeping on the banks of the Seine, surrounded by the vain trophies of battle ; nay, more, from the sepulchres of all these broken empires, seem to proceed the words, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

Unity is the longing and tendency of Humanity ; not the enforced Unity of military power ; not the Unity of might triumphant over right ; not the Unity of inequality ; not the Unity which occupied the soul of Dante, when in his treatise *De Monarchia*, the earliest political work of modern times, he strove to show that all the world ought to be governed by one man, the successor of the Roman Emperor. Not these ; but the blessed, voluntary Unity of the various people of the earth in fraternal labors ;—the Unity promised, when it was said, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus ;"—the Unity which has filled the delighted vision of good men, of prophets, of sages, and poets, in times past ; — the Unity which, in our own age, prompted Beranger, the incomparable lyric of France, in an immortal ode, to salute the Holy Alliance of the peoples, summoning them in all lands, and by whatever names they may be called, French, English, Belgian, German, Russian, to give each other the hand, to the end that the useless thunderbolts of War shall all be quenched, and Peace shall sow the earth with gold, with flowers,

and with corn ;—the Unity which prompted an early American statesman and poet to anticipate the time when all the nations shall meet in Congress ;

To give each realm its limits and its laws,
 Bid the last breath of dire contention cease,
 And bind all regions in the leagues of Peace,
 Bid one great empire, with extensive sway,
 Spread with the sun, and bound the walks of day,
 One centered system, one all-ruling soul
 Live through the parts, and regulate the whole ;

the Unity, which has inspired the contemporary British poet, of exquisite beauty, Alfred Tennyson, to hail the certain day,

When the drums shall throb no longer, and the battle-flags be furled,
 In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World.

Such is Unity in the bonds of Peace. The common good and mutual consent are its adamant base ; Justice and Love its animating soul. These alone can give permanence to any combinations of men, whether in states or in confederacies. In these is the vital elixir of nations—the true philosopher's stone of divine efficacy, potent to keep alive the civilization of mankind. So far as these are neglected or forgotten, will the people, though under one apparent head, cease to be in reality united. So far as these are regarded, will the people within the sphere of their influence constitute one body, and be inspired by one spirit. And just in proportion as these sentiments find recognition from individuals, and from nations, will all War be impossible.

But not in vision, nor in promises only, is this Unity discerned. History reveals constant efforts for it in the voluntary associations, confederacies, leagues, coalitions and Congresses of Nations, which, though fugitive and limited in their influence, all attest the unsatisfied desires of men, solicitous for union, and show the means by which it may yet be permanently accomplished. Let me briefly enumerate some of these. 1. The *Amphictyonic Council*, embracing, at first, twelve, and finally thirty-one states or cities, was established in the year 497 before Christ. Each city sent two deputies, and had two votes in the Council, *which had full power to consider all differences* that might arise between the associate cities. 2. Next comes the *Achæan League*, founded at a very early period, and renewed in the year 284 before Christ. Each member of the League

was independent, and yet all together constituted one body. So great was the fame of their justice and probity, that the Greek cities of Italy were glad to refer disputes to their peaceful arbitration. 3. Passing over other confederacies of antiquity, I come to the *Hanseatic League*, begun in the twelfth century, completed near the middle of the thirteenth, and comprising at one time nearly eighty cities. A system of International Law was adopted in their general assemblies, and *courts of arbitration were established to determine controversies among the cities*. The decrees of these courts were enforced by placing the condemned city under what was called the ban, a sentence equivalent to the excommunication of the ecclesiastical law. But this League was not alone. 4. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, various other cities and nobles of Germany, entered into alliances and associations for mutual protection, under various names, as the *League of the Rhine*, and the *League of Suabia*. 5. To these I may add the combination of the *Armed Neutrality* in 1780, uniting, in declared support of certain principles, a large cluster of nations—Russia, France, Spain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Prussia and the United States. 6. And still further, I may refer to various Congresses, whether at Utrecht, at Westphalia, at Cambray, at Aix la Chapelle, or at Vienna, whose professed object has been, after the wasteful struggles of War, to arrange the terms of Peace, and to arbitrate between nations.

These examples, which belong to the Past, reveal the tendencies and capacities of nations. There are other instances, however, which come with the effect of living authority, while they afford a practical illustration of the means by which the War System of the Commonwealth of Christian States may be overthrown. There is, *first*, the Swiss Republic, or *Helvetic Union*, which began as long ago as 1830, and has preserved Peace among its members during the greater part of five centuries. In speaking of this Union, Vattel says, in the early part of the last century,* “The Swiss have had the precaution, in all alliances among themselves, and even with the neighboring powers, *to agree beforehand on the manner in which their disputes were to be submitted to arbitrators, in case they could not adjust them in an amicable manner*. This wise precaution has not a little contributed to maintain the Helvetic Republic in that flourishing state which secures its liberty, and renders it respectable throughout Europe.” Since these

* Law of Nations, Book II. chap. 18, § 329.

words were written, there have been many changes in the Swiss Constitution; but its present Federal System embracing upwards of twenty-four different states, established on the downfall of Napoleon, and again confirmed in 1830, provides that differences among the states shall be referred to "special arbitration." This is an instructive example. But *secondly*, our own happy country furnishes one yet more so. The United States of America are a Federal Union of thirty independent sovereign States,—each having peculiar interests,—in pursuance of a Constitution established in 1788, which not only provides a high tribunal for the adjudication of controversies between the States, but expressly *disarms* the individual States, declaring that "*no State shall, without consent of Congress, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, or engage in any war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.*" (Art. 1. Sec. 9.) A *third* example, not unlike that of our own country, is the *Confederation of Germany*, composed of thirty-eight sovereignties, who, by reciprocal stipulation in their Act of Union, (Sec. 12,) on the 8th of June, 1815, deprived each sovereignty of the *right of war* with its confederates. The words of this stipulation, as well as those of the Constitution of the United States, might furnish a model to the Commonwealth of Nations. They are as follows: "*The members further bind themselves under no pretence to declare war against one another, nor to pursue their mutual differences by force of arms, but engage to submit them to the Diet.*" The Diet is, in such cases, competent to attempt a reconciliation by the appointment of a select committee, and should this not prove successful, to procure a decision from a well-organized Court of Arbitration, *whose sentence is implicitly binding* upon the disputing parties."

Such are some of the authentic, well-defined examples of history. But this is not all. It seems in the order of Providence, that individuals, families, tribes, and nations, should tend, by means of association, to a final Unity. A law of mutual attraction, or affinity, first exerting its influence upon smaller bodies, draws them by degrees into well-established fellowship, and then continuing its power, fuses the larger bodies into nations; and nations themselves, stirred by this same sleepless energy, are now moving towards that grand system of combined order, which will complete the general harmony;

Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa par artus
Mens agit at molem, et magno se corpore miscet.

History bears ample testimony to the potency of this attraction. Modern Europe, in its early periods, was filled by petty lordships, or communities, constituting so many distinct units, acknowledging only a vague nationality, and maintaining among their cherished "liberties," the *right of war* with each other. The great states of our day have grown and matured into their present form, by the gradual absorption of these political bodies. Territories, which once possessed an equivocal and turbulent independence, now feel new power and happiness in peaceful association. Spain, composed of races, dissimilar in origin, religion and government, slowly ascended by progressive combinations among its principalities and provinces, till at last, in the fifteenth century, by the crowning union of Castile and Aragon, the whole country, with its various sovereignties, was united under one common rule. Germany once consisted of more than three hundred different principalities, each with the *right of war*. These slowly coalesced, forming larger principalities, till at last the whole complex aggregation of States, embracing bishoprics, abbeys, arch-bishoprics, duchies, counties, bailiwicks, electorates, margraviates, and free imperial cities, as gradually resolved into the present Confederation, wherein each State expressly renounces the *right of war* with its associates. France has passed through similar changes. By a power of assimilation, in no nation so strongly marked, she has absorbed the various races, and sovereignties, which once filled her territories with violence and conflict, and has converted them all to herself. The Roman or Iberian of Provence, the indomitable Celtic race, the German of Alsace, have all become Frenchmen, while the various provinces, once inspired by such hostile passions, Brittany and Normandy, Franche Comte and Bourgoyne, Gascogne and Languedoc, Provence and Dauphiny, are now blended in one powerful united nation. And Great Britain shows the influence of the same law. The many hostile principalities of England were first resolved into the Heptarchy; and these seven kingdoms became *one* under the Saxon Edgar. Wales, which was forcibly attached to England under Edward I., has at last entirely assimilated with her conquerer. Ireland, after a protracted resistance, was finally absorbed under Edward III., and at a later day, after a series of bitter struggles, was united — I do not say how successfully — under the imperial parliament. Scotland became connected with England by the accession of James I. to the throne of the Tudors; and these two countries, which had so often

encountered in battle, at last, under Queen Anne, were joined together by an act of peaceful legislation.

Thus has this tendency to Unity predominated over independent sovereignties and states, slowly conducting the great process of crystallization, which is constantly going on among the nations. But this cannot be arrested here. The next stage must be the peaceful association of the Christian States. In this anticipation we but follow the analogies of the material creation, whether regarded in the illumination of chemical or of geological science. Every where nature is proceeding with her combinations; with occult incalculable power, drawing elements into new relations of harmony; uniting molecule with molecule, atom with atom, and, by progressive changes, in the lapse of time, producing new structural arrangements. Look still closer, and the analogy will still continue. At first we detect only the operation of cohesion, rudely acting upon particles near together. This is followed by subtler influences, slowly imparting regularity of form, while heat, electricity, and potent chemical affinities, all conspire in the work. Yet still we have an incomplete body. *Light* now exerts its mysterious powers, and all assumes an organized form. So it is also with mankind. The rude cohesion of early ages, acting only upon individuals near together, first appears. Slowly does the work proceed. But time and space, the great obstructions, if not annihilated, are now subdued, giving free scope to the powerful affinities of civilization. At last light—hail! holy light!—in whose glad beams are knowledge, morals and religion, with empyrean sway, shall resolve these separate and distracted elements into one organized system.

Thus much for the examples and tendencies of nations. In harmony with these are the *efforts of individuals* in various ages, strengthening with time, till now at last they swell into a voice that must be heard. A rapid glance at these will show the growth of the cause which we have met to welcome. Far off in the writings of the early Fathers of the Christian Church, we learn the duty and importance of Universal Peace. But the rude hoof of War trampled down these sparks of generous truth, destined to flame forth at a later day. In the fifteenth century, the character of the *good Man of Peace* was described in that work of unexampled circulation, which has been translated into all modern tongues, and republished more than a thousand times, the Imitation of Christ, by

Thomas a Kempis. At the close of the same century, the cause of Peace found important support from the pen of a great scholar, the gentle and learned Erasmus. At last it obtained a specious advocacy from the throne. Henry IV., of France, with the cooperation of his minister, Sully, conceived the beautiful scheme of blending the Christian States in one Confederacy, with a high tribunal for the decision of controversies between them. He had drawn into his plan Queen Elizabeth of England, when all was arrested by the dagger of the assassin. But this gay and gallant monarch was little penetrated by the divine sentiment of Peace; for at his death he was gathering the materials for fresh War; and it is unhappily too evident, that even in his scheme of a European Congress, he was animated by a selfish ambition to humble Austria, rather than by a comprehensive humanity. Still his scheme has performed the important office of holding aloft before Christendom the practical idea of a tribunal for the Commonwealth of Nations.

The cause of Universal Peace was not destined thus early to receive the direct countenance of governments. But the efforts of private persons now began to multiply. Grotius, in his great work on the Law of Nations, while lavishing learning and genius in illustrating the Arbitrament of War, still bears testimony in favor of a more rational tribunal for international controversies. "It would be useful, and in some sort necessary," he says, in language which, if carried out practically, would sweep away the whole system of the *Laws of War*, "to have Congresses of the Christian Powers, where differences might be determined by the judgment of those who are not interested in them, and means might be found to constrain parties to accept peace on just conditions."* To the discredit of his age, these moderate words were received with smiles of derision, and the eminent expounder of the Laws of War and Peace was, on this account, condemned as rash, visionary and impracticable. But the sentiment, in which they had their origin, found other forms of utterance. Before the close of the seventeenth century, Nicole, the friend of Pascal, belonging to the fellowship of Port-Royal, and one of the highest names in the Church of France, gave to the world, in his *Moral Essays*, a brief *Treatise on the means of preserving Peace among men*, (*Traite des Moyens de conserver le Paix avec les Hommes*) a production which Voltaire, in exaggerated praise,

*Lib. II. Cap. 23, § 8.

terms, "a master-piece to which nothing equal has been left by anti-quity." There next appeared a work, little known in our day, entitled *Nouveau Cyneas* — the name being suggested by the pacific adviser of Pyrrhus, the warrior king of Epirus — wherein the unknown author counselled sovereigns to govern their states in Peace, and to cause their differences to be judged by an established tribunal. And in Germany, as we learn from Leibnitz, who also mentions the last authority, at the close of the seventeenth century, a retired general, who had commanded armies, the Landgrave Ernest of Hesse Reinfels, in a work entitled *The Discreet Catholic*, offered a project for Perpetual Peace, by means of a tribunal established by associate sovereigns. Contemporaneously with these efforts, William Penn, in England, published an "Essay on the present and future Peace of Europe," in which he urged the plan of a general Congress for the settlement of international disputes, and referred with praise to the "great design" of Henry IV. Thus, by his writings, as also by his illustrious example in Pennsylvania, did he show himself the friend of Peace.

These were soon followed by the untiring labors of the good Abbe Saint Pierre, of France, the most efficient among the early apostles of Peace. He is not to be confounded with the eloquent and eccentric Bernardin de St. Pierre, the author of *Paul and Virginia*, who, at a later day, beautifully painted the true Fraternity of Nations.* Of a genius less artistic or literary, the Abbe consecrated a whole life, crowned by extreme old age, to the improvement of mankind. There was no humane cause which he did not espouse; but he was especially filled with the idea of Universal Peace, and with the importance of teaching nations, not less than individuals, the duty of doing to others as they would have others do unto them. His views are elaborately presented in a work of three volumes, entitled *A Project for Perpetual Peace*, wherein he proposes a Diet or Congress of Sovereigns for the adjudication of international controversies without resort to War. Throughout his voluminous writings, he constantly returns to this project, which was the cherished vision of his life. More than once the regret falls from him, that the exalted genius of Newton and Descartes had not been devoted to the study

*Œuvres de Bernardin de St. Pierre, Tom. X. p. 138. *Harmonies de la Nature*; Tom. II. p. 163. *Vœux d'un Solitaire*.

and exposition of the great laws which determine the welfare of men and of nations, believing that they might have succeeded in organizing Peace. He often dwells on the beauty of Christian precepts, as a rule of public conduct, and on the true glory of beneficence, while he exposes the vanity of military renown, and does not hesitate to question that false glory which procured for Louis XIV, from flattering courtiers and a barbarous world, the undeserved title of Great. He enriched the French language with the word *bienfaisance*; and D'Alembert said that it was right he should have invented the word, who practised so largely the virtue which it expresses.

I need hardly add that, though thus of benevolence all-compact, St. Pierre was not the favorite of his age. A profligate minister, Cardinal Dubois—the ecclesiastical companion of a vicious regent in the worst excesses, condemned his ideas in a phrase of satire, as “the dreams of a good man.” The pen of La Bruyere wantoned in a petty portrait of the good man’s personal peculiarities. Many averted from him the countenance. To the scandal of literature and of science, the academy of France, of which he was a member, on the occasion of his death, forebore the eulogy which is its customary tribute to a departed academician. But an incomparable genius in Germany,—an authority not to be questioned on any subject upon which he ventured to speak,—Leibnitz, bears his testimony to the Project of Perpetual Peace, and in so doing, enrolls his own mighty name in the sacred catalogue of our cause. In some observations on this Project, communicated to its author, under date of Feb. 7, 1715,* after declaring, that it touches a matter which interests the whole human race, and is not foreign to his studies, as from his youth he had occupied himself with law, and particularly with the Law of Nations, Leibnitz says: “*I have read it with attention, and am persuaded that such a Project on the whole is feasible, and that its execution would be one of the most useful things in the world. Although my suffrage cannot be of any weight, I have nevertheless thought that gratitude obliged me not to withhold it, and to join to it some remarks for the satisfaction of a meritorious author, who ought to have much reputation and firmness, to have dared and been able to oppose with success the prejudiced crowd, and the unbridled tongue of mockers.*” Such language from Leibnitz must have been precious

*Leibnitz, Opera, Tom. V. pp. 56—62, (ed Dutens.)

even to Saint Pierre. I cannot close this brief sketch of a philanthropist ever constant in an age when philanthropy was little regarded, without offering him my unaffected homage. To him may be addressed the sublime salutation, which hymned from the soul of Milton:

Servant of God, well-done! well hast thou fought
 The better fight, who single hast maintained
 Against revolted multitudes the cause
 Of truth, in word mightier than in arms;
 And for the testimony of truth hast borne
 reproach, far worse to bear
 Than violence; for this was all thy care,
 To stand approved in sight of God, though worlds
 Judged thee perverse.

Our world hereafter, as it wakes from its martial trance, shall salute, with gratitude and admiration, the true greatness of his career. It may well measure its advance in civilization by its appreciation of his character.

Saint Pierre was followed in 1761 by that remarkable genius Rousseau, in a small work to which he modestly gave the title, *Extract from the Project of Perpetual Peace, by the Abbe Saint Pierre*. Without referring to those higher motives — as the love of true glory and of humanity, a regard for the dictates of conscience, and the precepts of religion — for addressing which to sovereigns, Saint Pierre incurred the ridicule of what are called practical statesmen — Rousseau appeals to the common sense of rulers, and shows how much their actual worldly interests would be promoted by submitting their pretensions to the Arbitration of an impartial tribunal, rather than to the uncertain issue of arms, which cannot bring even to the victor adequate compensation for the blood and treasure expended in the contest. If this project, he says, fails to be executed, it is not because it is chimerical; but because men have lost their wits, and it is a sort of madness to be wise in the midst of fools. As no scheme more grand, more beautiful, or more useful ever occupied the human mind, so, says Rosseau, no author ever deserved attention more than one proposing the means for its practical adoption; nor can any humane and virtuous man fail to regard it with something of enthusiasm.

The recommendations of Rosseau were encountered in Germany by a writer who will, probably, be remembered only by his hardihood on this occasion. I allude to Embser, who treats of Perpetual Peace in a work first published in 1779, under the title of *The Idol-*

atries of our Philosophical Century, (Die Abgotterei unsers philosophischen Jahrhunderts,) and, at a later day, appearing with a new title, under the alias of the *Refutation of the Project of Perpetual Peace* (Widerlegung des ewigen Friedens-projekts.) The objections, still common with superficial or prejudiced minds, are here vehemently urged; the imputation upon Grotius is reproduced; and the idea is pronounced visionary and impracticable, while War is held up as an instrument more beneficent than Peace in advancing the civilization of mankind.

But the cause of St. Pierre and Rousseau was not without champions. In 1763 appeared at Gottingen the work of Totze, entitled *Permanent and Universal Peace, according to the Plan of Henry IV.* (Ewiger und allgemeiner Friede nach der Entwurf Heinrichs IV.) And in 1767, at Leipzig, was published an ample and mature treatise on this subject, by Lilienfels, under the name of *New Constitution for States* (Neues Staatsgebaude.) Truth often appears contemporaneously to different minds, having no concert with each other; and this work, though in remarkable harmony with the labors of Saint Pierre and Rousseau, is said to have been composed without any knowledge of them. Lilienfels exposes the causes and calamities of War, the expenses of armaments in time of Peace, and the miserable chances of the battle-field, where controversies are determined, in defiance of all principles of justice, as by the throw of dice; and he urges the advantage of a submission of such matters to Arbitrators, unless a Supreme Tribunal should be established to administer the Law of Nations, and to judge between them. Such a Tribunal, according to him, should enforce its decrees by the combined power of the Confederacy.

It was left to another German mind, in intellectual pre-eminence the successor of Leibnitz, by especial and repeated labors, to illustrate this cause. At Konigsberg, in a retired part of Prussia, away from the great lines of travel, Immanuel Kant consecrated his days to the pursuit of truth. During a long, virtuous and disinterested career, stretching beyond the period appointed for man — from 1724 to 1804 — in retirement, undisturbed by the shocks of revolution and war, never drawn by the temptations of life more than seven German miles from the place of his birth, he assiduously studied books, men and things. Among the fruits of his ripened powers was that system of Philosophy, known as the *Critique of Pure Reason*, by which he was at once established as a master-mind of

his country. His words became the text for writers almost without number, who vied with each other in expounding, in illustrating, or in opposing his principles. At this period — after an unprecedented triumph in philosophy, when his name had become familiar wherever his mother-tongue was spoken, and while his rare faculties were yet untouched by decay, in the Indian summer of his life — the great thinker published a work *On Perpetual Peace* (Zum ewigen Frieden, 1796.) The interest in the author, or in the cause, was attested by prompt translations of this philanthropic production into the French, Danish and Dutch languages. The same cause was espoused in another effort entitled *Idea for a General History in a Cosmopolitan View* (Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht;) and finally in his *Metaphysical Elements of Jurisprudence* (Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre.) In the lapse of time, the speculations of the philosopher have lost much of their original attraction; and other systems, with other names, have taken their place. But these early and faithful labors for Perpetual Peace cannot be forgotten. Perhaps by these the fame of the applauded philosopher of Königsberg may yet be preserved.

By Perpetual Peace, Kant understood a condition of states in which there could be no fear of War; and this condition, he said, was demanded by reason, which abhors all War, as little adapted to establish right, and which must regard this final development of the Law of Nations as a consummation worthy of every effort. To this all persons, and particularly the rulers of states, should bend their energies. A special league or treaty should be entered into, which may truly be called a *Treaty of Peace*, differing from other treaties in this regard, that, whereas these terminate a single existing War only, this should seek to terminate forever all War between the parties to it. Treaties of Peace, tacitly acknowledging the *right to wage war*, as all treaties now do, are nothing more than a truce; they are not Peace. By these treaties an individual war may be ended; but not the *state of war*. There may not be constant hostilities; but there will be constant fear of them, with constant threats of aggression and attack. The soldiers and armaments now nursed by civilized states, as a Peace establishment, become the fruitful parent of new wars. With real Peace, these would be abandoned. Nor should states hesitate to submit, like individuals, *to law*. They should form one comprehensive Federation of Nations, which, by the addition of other nations, should at last embrace the

whole earth. And this, according to Kant, in the succession of years, by a sure progress, is the irresistible tendency of nations.

These views found immediate support from another German philosopher, Fichte, of remarkable acuteness and perfect devotion to truth, whose name, in his own day, awakened an echo inferior only to that of Kant. In his *Groundwork of the Law of Nature* (*Grundlage des Naturrechts*), published in 1796, he urges a Federation of Nations, with a tribunal for the determination of international controversies, as the best way of securing the triumph of justice, and of subduing the power of the unjust. To the suggestion that by this Federation, injustice might be done to an individual state, he replied, that it would not be easy for the confederate nations to find any common advantage to tempt them to do this wrong. This subject was again handled in 1804, by a learned German, Charles Schwab, whose work, entitled *Of unavoidable Injustice* (*Über das unvermeidliche Unrecht*) is marked by great clearness and directness. He looks forward to the *Universal State*, in which nations shall be united together, as citizens are now united in a municipal state. He does not believe that in this condition justice will be always inviolate; for, as between citizens in the state, it is not so; but that it will become generally established. As in the municipal state War no longer prevails, but offences, wrongs and sallies of vengeance often proceed from individual citizens, and insubordination and anarchy may sometimes show themselves; so in the *Universal State* War will be extinguished; but here also, between the different nations, who will be as citizens in the Federation, there may be wrongs and aggressions, and even the common power may be resisted. In short, the *Universal State* will be subject to the same accidents with the municipal state.

The cause of Permanent Peace now became a thesis for Universities. At Stuttgart, in 1796, there was an oration by J. H. La Motte, entitled *Utrum Pax Perpetua pangi possit, nec ne?* And again at Leyden, in Holland, in 1808, a Dissertation was written by Gabinus de Wal, on taking his degree of Doctor of Laws, entitled *Disputatio Philosophico-Juridica de Conjunctione Populorum ad Pacem Perpetuam*. This learned and elaborate performance reviews the previous efforts in the cause, giving a pre-eminence to those of Kant. Such a voice from a pupil of the University is a token of the sentiments of the time, and an example for the youth of our own day.

Meanwhile in England, that indefatigable jurist and reformer, Jeremy Bentham, entered upon similar speculations. In an Essay on International Law, bearing date from 1786 to 1789, and first published in 1839, by his Executor, Dr. Bowring,* he develops a plan for Universal and Perpetual Peace in the spirit of Saint Pierre. According to him, such is the extreme folly, the madness of War, that on no supposition can it be otherwise than mischievous. All trade, in its essence, is advantageous, even to that party to whom it is least so. All war, in its essence, is ruinous; and yet the great employments of government are to treasure up occasions of War, and to put fetters upon trade. To remedy this evil, Bentham proposes, first, “the reduction and fixation of the forces of the several Nations, that compose the European system,” and enforcing this proposition, he says, “Whatsoever nation should get the start of the other in making the proposal to reduce and fix the amount of its armed force, would crown itself with everlasting honor. The risk would be nothing—the gain certain. This gain would be, the giving an incontrovertible demonstration of its own disposition to peace, and of the opposite disposition in the other nation in case of its rejecting the proposal.” He next proposes the establishment of a Court of Judicature for the settlement of international differences, with power to report its opinion, and cause it to be circulated in the territories of each state; and after a certain time, to put a refractory state under the ban of Europe. The whole arrangement he urges, can in no respect be styled visionary, for it is proved, *first*, that it is the interest of the parties concerned; *secondly*, that they are already sensible of that interest; and *thirdly*, the situation in which it would place them is not new, but finds a parallel in the difficult and complicated conventions, which have already been effected between nations.

Coming to our own country, I find many names worthy of commemoration in our cause. No person, in all history, has borne his testimony against War in phrases of greater pungency and of more convincing truth than Benjamin Franklin. “There never has been,” he says, “nor ever will be, any such thing as a good War, or a bad Peace;” and he asks, “When will mankind be convinced of this, and agree to settle their difficulties by Arbitration? Were they to do it even by the cast of a die, it would be better than by

* Bentham's Works, Part VIII., pp. 537 - 554.

fighting and destroying each other." As a diplomatist, Franklin strove to limit the evils of War. From him, while Minister of the United States, at Paris, proceeded those instructions, more honorable to the American name than any battle, directing the naval cruisers of our country, among whom were the redoubtable Paul Jones, if they should encounter the returning expedition of the great English navigator, Capt. Cook, to allow it, in the sacred interests of universal science, a free and undisturbed passage. And still later, to him belongs the honor of introducing, into a treaty with Prussia, a clause for the abolition of that special scandal, private War on the ocean. In similar strain with Franklin, Jefferson says, "Will nations never devise a more rational umpire of differences than Force? War is an instrument entirely inefficient towards redressing wrong, and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses." And he proceeds to exhibit the waste of War, and the beneficent consequences, if its expenditures could be diverted to purposes of practical utility.

To Franklin and Jefferson we freely render thanks for their authoritative words and example. But there are three names, fit successors of Saint Pierre,—I speak now, of course, only of those whose career is ended, and on whose good works is the heavenly signet of death,—which more than theirs deserve the affectionate regard of the friends of Peace. I refer to Noah Worcester, William Ellery Channing, and William Ladd. It would be a grateful task to dwell on the services of these our virtuous champions. The occasion will allow only a passing notice. In Worcester we behold the single-minded country clergyman, little gifted as a preacher, with narrow means,—and his example teaches what such a character may accomplish,—in his humble retirement pained by the reports of War, and at last, when the great European drama of battles closed at Waterloo, published that appeal, entitled "A solemn Review of the Custom of War," which has been so extensively circulated at home and abroad, and has done so much to correct the inveterate prejudices which surround our cause. He was the founder, and for some time the indefatigable agent, of the earliest Peace Society in the country. The eloquence of Channing, both with tongue and pen, was often directed against War. He was heart-struck by the awful moral degradation which it caused, rudely blotting out in men the image of God their Father; and his words of flame have lighted in many souls those exterminating fires that shall never die, until this evil is scourged from the earth. William Ladd, after completing

his education at Harvard University, entered into commercial pursuits. Early blessed with competency through his own exertions, he could not be idle. He was childless; and his affections embraced all the children of the human family. Like Worcester and Channing, his attention was arrested by the portentous crime of War, and he was moved to dedicate the remainder of his days to earnest, untiring efforts for its abolition; going about from place to place, to inculcate the blessed lessons of Peace; with simple, cheerful manner, winning the hearts of good men, and dropping in many youthful souls the precious seeds which shall ripen in more precious fruit. He was the founder of the American Peace Society, in which was finally merged the earlier association, established by Worcester. By a long series of practical labors in our cause, and especially by developing, maturing and publishing to the world, the plan of a Congress of Nations, has William Ladd enrolled himself among the benefactors of mankind.

Such are some of the names which, hereafter, when the warrior no longer receives from the world the "blessings" promised to the "Peace-maker," shall be inscribed on immortal tablets.

And now at last, in the fulness of time, in our own day, by the labors of men of Peace, by the irresistible co-operating affinities of mankind, nations seem to be visibly approaching — even amidst tumult and discord — that Unity, so long hoped for, prayed for. By steamboats, railroads, and telegraphs, outstripping the traditional movements of governments, men of all countries daily commingle; ancient prejudices fast dissolve; while ancient sympathies strengthen, and new sympathies come into being. The chief commercial cities of England send addresses of friendship to the chief commercial cities of France; and the latter delight to return the salutation. Similar cords of amity are woven between cities in England, and cities in our own country. The visit to London of a band of French National Guards is reciprocated by the visit to Paris of a large company of Englishmen. Thus are pacific conquests now achieved, where formerly all the force of arms could not prevail. Mr. Vattemare perambulates Europe and the United States, to establish a happy system of literary international exchanges. By the daily agency of the press we are made sharers in the trials and triumphs of our brethren in all lands, and learn to live no longer in the solitude of insulated nationalities, but in the communion of associated states.

By the multitudinous reciprocities of commerce, are developed relations of mutual dependence, stronger than treaties or alliances written on parchment ; while, from a true appreciation of the ethics of government, we arrive at the conviction, that the divine injunction, ‘ Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,’ was spoken to nations as well as to individuals.

From increasing knowledge of each other, and from a higher sense of our duties as brethren of the Human Family, arises an increasing interest in each other ; and charity, which was once, like patriotism, exclusively national, is beginning to clasp the world in its loving embrace. Every discovery of science, every aspiration of philanthropy, in whatever country it may have its birth, is now poured into the common stock of mankind. Assemblies, whether of science or of philanthropy, are no longer merely municipal, but gladly welcome delegates from all the nations. Science has had her Congresses in Italy, in Germany, and in England. Great causes — grander even than science — like Temperance, Freedom, Peace — have drawn to London large bodies of men from different countries, under the title of *World Conventions*, in whose very name, and in whose spirit of fraternity, we discern the prevailing tendency. Such a convention, dedicated to Universal Peace, held at London in 1843, was graced by the presence of many persons well known for their labors of humanity. At Frankfort, in 1846, was assembled a large Congress from all parts of Europe, to consider what could be done for those who were in prison. The succeeding year witnessed, at Brussels, a similar Congress, convened in the same charity. And at last, in August, 1848, we hail, at Brussels, another Congress, inspired by the presence of a generous American, Elihu Burritt, — who has left his anvil at home to teach the nations to change their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, — presided over by an eminent Belgian magistrate ; and composed of numerous individuals, speaking various languages, living under diverse forms of government, differing in political opinions, differing in religious convictions, but all drawn together by a common sacred sentiment, to pledge themselves to united strenuous efforts for the abolition of War, and for the disarming of the nations.

The Peace Congress at Brussels constitutes an epoch in our cause. It is a palpable development of those international attractions and affinities which are now awaiting their final organization. The resolutions which it has put forth, are so important, that I cannot hesitate to introduce them here :

1st. That, in the judgment of this Congress, an appeal to arms for the purpose of deciding disputes among nations, is a custom condemned alike by religion, reason, justice, humanity, and the best interests of the people; and that, therefore, it considers it to be the duty of the civilized world to adopt measures calculated to effect its entire abolition.

2d. That it is of the highest importance to urge on the several Governments of Europe and America the necessity of introducing a clause into all International Treaties, providing for the settlement of all disputes by Arbitration, in an amicable manner, and according to the rules of justice and equity, by special Arbitrators, or a Supreme International Court, to be invested with power to decide in cases of necessity, as a last resort.

3d. That the speedy convocation of a Congress of Nations, composed of duly appointed representatives, for the purpose of framing a well digested and authoritative International Code, is of the greatest importance, inasmuch as the organization of such a body, and the unanimous adoption of such a Code, would be an effectual means of promoting universal Peace.

4th. That this Congress respectfully calls the attention of civilized Governments to the necessity of a general and simultaneous disarmament, as a means whereby they may greatly diminish the financial burdens which press upon them; remove a fertile cause of irritation and inquietude; inspire mutual confidence; and promote the interchange of good offices; which, while they advance the interests of each state in particular, contribute largely to the maintenance of general Peace, and the lasting prosperity of nations.

In France these resolutions have received the adhesion of Lamar-tine; in England, of Richard Cobden. They have been welcomed throughout Great Britain, by large and enthusiastic popular assemblies, hanging with delight upon the practical lessons of peace on earth and good will to men, poured by eloquent voices into unaccustomed ears. At the suggestion of the Congress at Brussels, and in harmony with the demands of an increasing public sentiment, another Congress, in the approaching month of August, will be convened at Paris. The place of meeting is auspicious. There, as in the very cave of Æolus, whence have so often raged forth the conflicting winds and resounding tempests of War, will assemble delegates from various nations, including a large number from our own country, whose glad work will be to hush and imprison these winds and tempests, and to bind them in the chains of everlasting Peace. May God prosper the endeavor!

But not in voluntary assemblies only has our cause found welcome. It has effected an entrance into *legislative halls*. A document now before me in the hand-writing of Samuel Adams, an approved patriot of the Revolution, bears witness to his desires for action on this subject in the Congress of the United States. It is in the form of a Letter of Instructions from the Legislature of Massachusetts to the delegates in Congress from that State; and, though

without date, seems to have been prepared some time between the Treaty of Peace in 1783, and the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1789. It is as follows :

GENTLEMEN,—

Although the General Court have lately instructed you concerning various matters of very great importance to this Commonwealth, they cannot finish the business of the year until they have transmitted to you a further instruction which they have long had in contemplation; and which, if their most ardent wish could be obtained, might in its consequences extensively promote the happiness of man.

You are, therefore, hereby instructed and urged, to move the United States in Congress assembled to take into their deep and most serious consideration, whether any measures can by them be used, through their influence with such of the nations in Europe with whom they are united by Treaties of Amity or Commerce, that National Differences may be settled and determined, without the necessity of WAR, in which the world has too long been deluged, to the destruction of human happiness, and the disgrace of human reason and government.

If, after the most mature deliberation, it shall appear that no measures can be taken *at present* on this very interesting subject, it is conceived, it would redound much to the honor of the United States, that it was attended to by their great Representative in Congress, and be accepted as a testimony of gratitude for most signal favors granted to the said States by Him who is the almighty and most gracious Father and Friend of mankind.

And you are further instructed, to move that the foregoing Letter of Instructions be entered on the Journals of Congress, if it may be thought proper, that so it may remain for the inspection of the delegates from this Commonwealth, if necessary, in any *future* time.

I am not able to ascertain whether this document ever became a legislative act; but it attests, in an authentic form, that a prominent leader of public opinion in Massachusetts, after the establishment of that Independence for which he had so assiduously labored, hoped to enlist not only the Legislature of this State, but the Congress of the United States, in efforts for the emancipation of nations from the tyranny of War. For this early effort at a period when the cause of Permanent Peace had never been introduced to any legislative body, Samuel Adams deserves grateful mention.

At last, many years later, the subject reached Congress. In 1838, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States, in a report drawn up by the late Mr. Legare, prompted by memorials from the friends of Peace, while injudiciously discountenancing the idea of an Association of Nations, as not yet sanctioned by public opinion, acknowledge, “that the union of all nations in a state of Peace, under the restraints and protection of law, is the ideal perfection of civil society; that they accord fully in the

benevolent object of the memorialists, and believe there is a visible tendency in the spirit and institutions of the age towards the practical accomplishment of it, at some future period ; that they heartily agree in recommending a reference to a Third Power of all such controversies as can be safely confided to any tribunal unknown to the Constitution of our country ; and that such a practice will be followed by other powers, and will soon grow up into the customary law of civilized nations." The Legislature of Massachusetts, by a series of resolutions, in harmony with the early sentiments of Samuel Adams, adopted with exceeding unanimity in 1844, declare, that they "regard Arbitration as a practical and desirable substitute for War, in the adjustment of international differences ;" and still further declare their "earnest desire that the government of the United States would, at the earliest opportunity, take measures for obtaining the consent of the powers of Christendom to the establishment of a General Convention or Congress of Nations, for the purpose of settling the principles of international law, and of organizing a high Court of Nations to adjudge all cases of difficulty which may be brought before them by the mutual consent of two or more nations." During the winter of 1849, the subject was again presented to the American Congress. On Tuesday, January 16th, Mr. Tuck asked the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, to offer the following preamble, and resolution :

Whereas the evils of War are acknowledged by all civilized nations, and the calamities, individual and general, which are inseparably connected with it, have attracted the attention of many humane and enlightened citizens of this and of other countries ; and whereas, it is the disposition of the people of the United States to co-operate with others in all appropriate and judicious exertions to prevent a recurrence of national conflicts ; therefore

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be directed to inquire into the expediency of authorizing a correspondence to be opened by the Secretary of State with Foreign Governments, on the subject of procuring Treaty stipulations for the reference of all future disputes to a friendly Arbitration, or for the establishment instead thereof of a Congress of Nations, to determine International law and settle International disputes.

Though for the present unsuccessful, this excellent effort will prepare the way for another trial.

Nor does it stand alone. Almost contemporaneously, M. Bouvet, in the National Assembly of France, submitted a proposition of a similar character, the official record of which is as follows :

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY.

Proposition relative to the opening of a Universal Congress, having for its object a proportional disarmament among all recognized States. Presented

the 8th of January, 1849, by the Citizen, Francisque Bouvet, representative of the People. Referred to the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

(*Urgency Demands.*)

Seeing that War between nations is contrary to religion, humanity, and the public well-being, the French National Assembly decrees:

First Article.—The French Republic proposes to the Governments and Representative Assemblies of the different States of Europe, America, and other civilized countries, to unite by their representation, in a Congress which shall have for its object a proportional disarmament among the powers, the abolition of War, and a substitution for that barbarous usage, of an Arbitral jurisdiction, of which the said Congress shall immediately fulfil the functions.

Second Article.—The Universal Congress shall commence on the 1st of May, 1849, at Constantinople.

Third Article.—The President of the Republic is charged to notify the present proposition to all the Governments and Representative Assemblies of civilized States, and to use all the means in his power to induce them to concur in it.

In an elaborate report, the French Committee on Foreign Affairs, while declining at present to recommend this proposition, distinctly sanction its object.

At a still earlier date, some time in the summer of 1848, Arnold Ruge brought the same measure before the German Parliament at Frankfort, by moving the following amendment to the Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations :

That, as armed peace, by its standing armies, imposes an intolerable burden upon the people of Europe, and endangers civil freedom, we therefore recognize the necessity of calling into existence a Congress of Nations, for the object of effecting a general disarmament of Europe.

Though this proposition failed to be adopted, yet the mover is reported to have sustained it by a speech, which was received with applause both in the assembly and in the gallery. Among other things he used these important words :

There is no necessity of feeding an army of military idlers and eaters. There is nothing to fear from our neighboring barbarians, as they are called. You must give up the idea that the French *will* eat us up, and that the Prussians *can* eat us up. Soldiers must cease to exist; then shall no more cities be bombarded. These opinions must be kept up and propagated by a Congress of Nations. I vote that the nations of Europe disarm at once.

In the British Parliament, also, our cause has found an able representative in Mr. Cobden, whose name is an omen of success. He has not only addressed many large popular bodies in its behalf, but already by speech and motion, in the House of Commons, has striven for a reduction in the armaments of Great Britain, and has only late-

ly given notice of the following motion, which he intends to call up in that assembly at the earliest moment :

That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying she will be graciously pleased to direct her Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to enter into communication with Foreign Powers, inviting them to concur in treaties, binding the respective parties, in the event of any future misunderstanding which cannot be arranged by amicable negotiation, to refer the matter in dispute to the decision of arbitrators.*

*Mr. Sumner brought the history of the Peace movement down to the date of his address in 1849; but it may be well to add a brief sketch of its progress to the present time, (January, 1854,) in reference especially to *Substitutes for War*.

PEACE CONGRESSES.—Since the delivery of Mr. Sumner's Address, there have been held in Europe three General Peace Congresses—one at Paris, in August, 1849; another at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in August, 1850; and a third at London, in July, 1851, in connection with the World's Industrial Exhibition;—all, but more especially the last one, numerously attended, and honored with the presence and active support of some of the ablest and most influential men in the Old World. Each of these Congresses took, with entire unanimity, the same ground with the Congress at Brussels on all the great practical issues and measures of the Peace Cause, besides other resolves of like import, especially on Non-Intervention as a peace movement.

ACTION BY OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.—The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which closed our war with Mexico, and was ratified by the U. S. Senate in May, 1848, embodies, though in clumsy, indecisive terms, the great idea of Stipulated Arbitration for the settlement of all future controversies between the two Republics. A provision so vaguely expressed cannot be regarded as a reliable guaranty against War; and yet it very distinctly recognizes the principle for which the friends of Peace contend. It is as follows:—

ARTICLE XXI. If unhappily any disagreement should hereafter arise between the governments of the two republics, whether with respect to the interpretation of any stipulation in this treaty, or with respect to any other particular concerning the political or commercial relations of the two nations, the said governments, in the name of those nations, do promise to each other that they will endeavor, in the most sincere and earnest manner, to settle the differences so arising, and to preserve the state of peace and friendship in which the two countries are now placing themselves, using, for this end, mutual representations and pacific negotiations. And if, by these means, they should not be enabled to come to an agreement, a resort shall not, on this account, be had to reprisals, aggression, or hostility of any kind, by the one republic against the other, until the government of that which deems itself aggrieved shall have maturely considered, in the spirit of peace and good neighborship, whether it would not be better that such difference should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation. And should such course be proposed by either party, it shall be acceded to by the other, unless deemed by it altogether incompatible with the nature of the difference, or the circumstances of the case.

It is worthy of note, that no objection was made to this article. 'I was present,' said a Senator to us, in conversation on this point, 'during all the protracted discussions in the Senate on the Treaty; and, though objections were urged to almost every other part, I recollect none whatever to this provision.'

In February, 1851, Hon. HENRY S. FOOTE, of Mississippi, as Chairman of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, recommended unanimously the adoption of the following preamble and resolution:—

Whereas appeals to the sword for the determination of national controversies are always productive of immense evils; and whereas the spirit and enterprises of the

Such is the Peace Movement. With the ever-flowing current of time it has gained ever-increasing strength; and it has now become like a mighty river. At first but a slender fountain, sparkling upon some lofty summit, it has swollen with every tributary rill, with the friendly rains and dews of heaven, and at last with the associate waters of various nations, until it washes the feet of populous cities rejoicing on its peaceful banks. By the voices of poets; by the aspirations and labors of statesmen, of philosophers, of good men; by the experience of history; by the peaceful union into nations of families, tribes and provinces, divesting themselves of the "liberty" to wage War; by the example of leagues, alliances, confederacies and congresses; by the kindred movements of our age, all tending to Unity; by an awakened public sentiment, and a growing recognition of the Brotherhood of Mankind; by the sympathies of large popular assemblies; by the formal action of legislative bodies; by the promises of Christianity, are we encouraged to persevere in our work. So doing, we shall act not *against* nature. but *with* nature, making ourselves, according to the injunction of Lord Bacon, its ministers and interpreters. From no single man, from no body of men, does our cause proceed. Not from Saint Pierre or Leibnitz, from Rousseau or Kant, in other days; not from Jay or Burritt, from Cobden or Lamartine in our own. It is the irrepressible utterance of longing with which the great heart of Humanity labors; it is the universal

age, but more especially the genius of our own government, the habits of our people, and the highest permanent prosperity of our republic, as well as the claims of humanity, the dictates of enlightened reason, and the precepts of our holy religion, all require the adoption of every feasible measure, consistent with national honor, and the security of our rights, to prevent, as far as possible, the recurrence of war hereafter; therefore,—

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this body, it would be proper and desirable for the government of these United States, whenever practicable, to secure, in its treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires, all future misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had.

There was no time for action then on the subject; and, when it came before the Senate at its next session, the Hon. J. R. UNDERWOOD, of Kentucky, on behalf of the same standing committee, made a long and very able report fully in favor of Stipulated Arbitration as a Substitute for War. See his report in the Appendix.

The Legislatures of Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Maine and Connecticut, at their sessions in 1852-3, passed resolves decidedly in favor of the same measure, with entire unanimity, we believe, in every case except one, and requested their Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their best endeavors for the accomplishment of the object. Had the subject been duly brought before the Legislatures of other States, there is reason to believe they would have taken similar action.

G. C. B.

expression of the Spirit of the Age, thirsting after Harmony ; it is the heaven-born whisper of Truth, immortal and omnipotent ; it is the word of God, published in commands as from the burning bush ; it is the soft voice of Christ, declaring to all mankind that they are brothers, and saying to the turbulent nationalities of the earth, as to the raging sea, " Peace, be still ! "

GENTLEMEN OF THE PEACE SOCIETY, — Such is the War System of the Commonwealth of Nations ; and such are the means and auguries of its overthrow. It is the chosen object of our Society, to aid and direct public sentiment so as most to hasten the coming of this day. All who have candidly attended me in this exposition, already too long protracted, will bear witness that we attempt nothing in any way inconsistent with the human character ; that we do not seek to suspend or hold in check any general laws of nature, but simply to bring nations within that established system of social order, which has already secured such inestimable good to civil society, and which is as applicable to nations as to individuals.

The tendencies of nations, as revealed in history, teach that our aims are in harmony with those prevailing natural laws, which God, in his benevolence, has ordained for mankind.

Examples teach also that we attempt nothing that is not directly practicable. If the several states of the Helvetic Republic ; if the thirty independent States of the North American Union ; if the thirty-eight independent sovereignties of the German Confederation can, by formal stipulations, divest themselves of the *right of war with each other*, and consent to submit all mutual controversies to Arbitration, or to a High Court of Judicature, then can the Commonwealth of Nations do the same. Nor should they hesitate, while, in the language of William Penn, such surpassing instances show that *it may be done*, and Europe, by her incomparable miseries, that *it ought to be done*. Nay more ; if it would be criminal in these several clusters of states to re-establish the Institution of War, as the Arbiter of Justice, then is it criminal in the Commonwealth of Nations to continue it.

Changes already wrought in the *Laws of War* teach still further that the whole System may be abolished. The existence of laws implies an authority that sanctions or enacts, which in the present case is the Commonwealth of Nations. But this authority can, of course, modify or abrogate what it has originally sanctioned or en-

acted. In the exercise of this power, the Laws of War have, from time to time, been modified in many important particulars. Prisoners taken in battle cannot now be killed; nor can they be reduced to slavery. Poison and assassination can no longer be employed against an enemy. Private property on land cannot be seized. Persons, occupied on land exclusively with the arts of Peace, cannot be molested. It remains that the authority, by which the Laws of War have been thus modified, should entirely abrogate them. Their existence is a disgrace to civilization; for it implies the *common consent* of nations to the Arbitrament of War, as regulated by these laws. Like the Laws of the Duel, they should yield to some arbitrament of reason. If the former, once firmly imbedded in the systems of municipal law, could be abolished by individual states, so also can the Laws of War, which are a part of international law, be abolished by the Commonwealth of Nations. In the light of reason and of religion, there can be but one Law of War — the great law which pronounces it unwise unchristian, and unjust, and forbids it forever as a crime.

In thus distinctly alleging the practicability of our aims, I may properly introduce here an incontrovertible authority. Listen to the words of an American statesman — whose long life was spent in the service of his country at home and abroad, and whose undoubted familiarity with the Law of Nations was never surpassed — John Quincy Adams. “War,” he says, in one of the legacies of his venerable experience,* “by the common consent, and mere will of civilized man, has not only been divested of its most atrocious cruelties, but for multitudes, growing multitudes of individuals, has already been, and is abolished. *Why should it not be abolished for all?* Let it be impressed upon the heart of every one of you — impress it upon the minds of your children, *that this total abolition of War upon earth* is an improvement in the condition of man, entirely dependent on his own will. He cannot repeal or change the laws of physical nature. He cannot redeem himself from the ills that flesh is heir to; but the ills of war and slavery are all of his own creation. He has but to will, and he effects the cessation of them altogether.”

Well does John Quincy Adams say, that mankind have but to *will* it, and War shall be abolished. Let them will it; and War shall disappear like the Duel. Let them will it; and War shall skulk

* Oration at Newburyport, July 4, 1839.

like the torture. Let them will it; and War shall fade away like the fires of religious persecution. Let them will it; and War shall pass among profane follies, like the ordeal of burning ploughshares. Let them will it; and War shall hurry to join the earlier Institution of Cannibalism. Let them will it; and War shall be chastised from the Commonwealth of Nations, as slavery has been chastised from their municipal jurisdictions, by England and France, by Tunis and Tripoli.

To arouse this powerful *public will*, which, like a giant, yet sleeps, but whose awakened voice nothing can withstand, should be our earnest endeavor. To do this we must never tire in exposing the true character of the War System. To be hated, it needs only to be comprehended; and it will surely be abolished as soon as it is sincerely hated. See, then, that it is comprehended. Expose its manifold atrocities, in the light of reason, of humanity of religion. Strip from it all its presumptuous pretences, its specious apologies, its hideous sorceries. Above all, let men no longer deceive themselves by the shallow thought that this System is a necessary incident of imperfect human nature, and thus continue to cast upon God the responsibility for their crimes. Let them see clearly, that it is a monster of their own creation, born with their consent, whose vital spark is fed by their breath, and without their breath must necessarily die. Let them see distinctly what I have so carefully presented to-night, that War, under the Law of Nations, is an Institution, and the whole War System is an Establishment for the administration of international justice, for which the Commonwealth of Nations is directly responsible, and which this Commonwealth can at any time remove.

As men come to recognize these things, they will instinctively cease to cherish War, and will refuse all appeal to its Arbitrament. They will forego their rights even rather than wage an irreligious battle. But criminal and irrational as is War, unhappily we cannot—in the present state of human error—expect large numbers to appreciate its true character, and to hate it with that perfect hatred, which shall cause them to renounce its agency, unless we can offer an approved and practical mode of determining the controversies of nations as a *substitute* for the imagined necessity of an appeal to the sword. This we are able to do; and so doing, we reflect new light upon the atrocity of a System which discards reason, defies justice, and tramples upon all the precepts of Christian love.

1. The most complete and permanent substitute for War would be a Congress of Nations, and a High Court of Judicature organized in pursuance thereof. Such a System, while admitted on all sides to promise many excellent results, is opposed on two grounds. *First*, it is said, that, as regards the smaller states, it would be a tremendous engine of oppression, subversive of their political independence. Surely it could not be so oppressive as the War System. But the experience of the smaller states in the German Confederation, and in the American Union — nay, the experience of Belgium and Holland, by the side of the overtopping power of France, and the experience of Denmark and Sweden in the very night-shade of Russia—all show the futility of this objection. And, *secondly*, it is said that the decrees of such a Court could not be carried into effect. Even if they were enforced by the combined power of the associate states, as the executive arm of the high tribunal, the sword would be the melancholy instrument of Justice only, but not the Arbiter of Justice. But there can be no occasion to entertain the question of the propriety or rightfulness of such a resort, so abhorrent to many of the friends of Peace, though clearly not obnoxious to the conclusive reasons against international appeals to the sword. We may learn, however, from the experience of history, and particularly from the experience of the thirty States of our Union, that there will be little occasion for any executive arm. The State of Rhode Island, in its recent controversy with Massachusetts, submitted, with much indifference, to the adverse decree of the Supreme Court of the United States; and I doubt not that Missouri and Iowa will submit with equal contentment to any determination of their present controversy by the same tribunal. The same submission would attend the decrees of any Court of Judicature, established by the Commonwealth of Nations. There is a growing sense of Justice, combined with a growing might of public opinion, whereof the soldier knows little, which would maintain the judgments of the august tribunal, assembled in the face of the nations, better than the swords of all the Marshals of France, better than the bloody terrors of Austerlitz or Waterloo.

The idea of a Congress of Nations, and of a High Court of Judicature, established in pursuance thereof, is as practicable as its consummation^o is confessedly dear to all friends of Universal Peace. Whenever this Congress is convened, as surely it will be convened, I know not all the names that will deserve commendation in its

earliest proceedings; but there are two, whose particular and long-continued advocacy of this Institution will connect them forever indissolubly with its fame—the Abbe Saint Pierre, of France, and William Ladd, of the United States.

2. But there is still another substitute for War, which is not open even to the superficial objections made to a Congress of Nations. By formal treaties between two or more nations, Arbitration may be established as the mode of determining controversies between them. In every respect this is a contrast to War. It is rational, humane and cheap. Above all, it is consistent with the precepts of Christianity. As I mention this substitute, I should do injustice to the cause, and to my own feelings, if I did not express the obligations of all the friends of Universal Peace to its efficient introducer and advocate, our fellow-citizen, and the President of our Society, the honored son of an illustrious father, whose absence to-night enables me, without offending his known modesty of character, to introduce this tribute—I mean William Jay.

The complete overthrow of the War System, involving, of course, the disarming of the Christian States, would follow the establishment of a Congress of Nations, or of a general System of Arbitration. Then at last would our aims be accomplished; then at last would Peace be organized among the nations, and once more angelic voices should fill the skies, and be echoed in every Christian breast.

Then, indeed, might Christians repeat the fitful boast of the generous Mohawk, saying, “We have thrown the hatchet so high into the air, and beyond the skies, that no arm on earth can reach to bring it down.” The incalculable sums, now devoted to armaments and the destructive industry of War, would be turned to the productive industry of Art, and to offices of Beneficence. As in the dead and rotten carcass of the lion, which roared against the strong man of Israel, after a time there was a swarm of bees and honey, so should crowds of useful laborers, and all good works take the place of the wild beast of War, and the riddle of Samson once more be interpreted; “Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness.”

Put together the products of all the mines of the world—the glistening ore of California, the accumulated treasures of Mexico and Peru, with the diamonds of Golconda, and the whole shining heap will be less than the means thus diverted from War to Peace. Under the blessed influence of such a change, civilization shall be

quickenéd anew. Then shall happy labor find its reward, and the whole land be filled with its increase. There is no aspiration of knowledge, no vision of charity, no venture of enterprise, no fancy of art which may not then be fulfilled. The great unsolved problem of Pauperism will at last be solved. There will be no paupers, when there are no soldiers. The social struggles, that now so fearfully disturb the European states, would die away in the happiness of an era of unarmed Peace, no longer encumbered by the oppressive System of War; nor can there be well-founded hope of any permanent cessation of these struggles so long as this System endures. The people ought not to rest; nay, they cannot rest, while the System endures. As King Arthur, prostrate on the earth, with bloody streams running from his sides, could not be at ease until his sword, the vengeful Excalibar, was thrown into the flood; so the nations, now prostrate on the earth, with bloody streams running from their sides, cannot be at ease until they fling far away the wicked sword of War.

Lop off the unchristian armaments of the Christian States; extirpate these martial cancers — that they may no longer feed upon the best life-blood of the people — and society itself, which is now so weary and sick, will become fresh and young; not by opening its veins, as under the incantation of Medea, in the wild hope of infusing new strength; but by the amputation and complete removal of a deadly excrescence, which is the occasion of unutterable debility and exhaustion. The energies, hitherto withdrawn from proper healthful action, will then replenish it with unwonted life and vigor, giving new expansion to every human capacity, and new elevation to every human aim. And society at last shall rejoice, like a strong man, to run its race.

Imagination toils in vain to picture the boundless good that will be thus achieved. As war and its deeds are infinitely evil and accursed, so will this triumph of Permanent Peace be infinitely beneficent and blessed. Something of its consequences were seen, as in prophetic vision, even by that incarnate Spirit of War, Napoleon, when, from his prison-island of St. Helena, looking back upon his mistaken career, he was led to confess the True Grandeur of Peace. Out of his mouth let its praise be spoken. "I had the project," he said, mournfully regretting the opportunity he had lost, "at the general peace of Amiens, of bringing each Power to an immense reduction of its standing armies. I wished a European Institute,

with European prizes, to direct, associate, and bring together all the learned societies of Europe. Then, perhaps, through the universal spread of light, it might be permitted to anticipate for the great European Family, the establishment of an American Congress, or an Amphycetionic Council; and what a perspective, at last, of grandeur, of happiness, of prosperity! What a sublime and magnificent spectacle!"

Such is our cause. In its mighty influence it embraces all the causes of human benevolence. It is the comprehensive charity, unfolding all the charities of all. There is none so vast as to be above its powerful protection; there is none so lowly as not to feel its generous care. Religion, Knowledge, Freedom, Virtue, Happiness, in all their manifold forms, depend upon Peace. Sustained by Peace, they lean as upon the Everlasting Arm. And this is not all. Law, Order, Government, derive new sanctions from our cause. Nor can they attain to that complete dominion which is our truest defence and safeguard, until, by the overthrow of the War System, they comprehend the Commonwealth of Nations;

And Sovereign LAW, *the world's collected will*,
O'er thrones and globes elate,
Sits empress, crowning good, repressing ill.

In the name of Religion profaned by War; of Knowledge misapplied and perverted; of Freedom crushed to earth; of Virtue dethroned; of human Happiness violated; in the name of Law, Order, and Government, I call upon you to unite in efforts to establish the supremacy of Peace. Let no person hesitate. With the lips you all confess the infinite evil of War. Are you in earnest? Let the confession of the lips be followed by corresponding action. Let all unite in endeavors to render the recurrence of this evil impossible. Science and humanity every where put forth their best energies against cholera and pestilence. Let equal energies be directed against an evil more fearful than cholera or pestilence. Let each man consider the cause his own concern. Let him animate his neighbors in its behalf. Let him seek, in all proper ways, to influence the rulers of the Christian States, and above all, the rulers of this happy land.

Let the old, the middle-aged, and the young, combine in a common cause. Let the pulpit, the school, the college, and the public street all be moved to speak in its behalf. Preach it, minister

of the Prince of Peace! Let it never be forgotten in conversation, in sermon or in prayer; nor any longer seek, by subtle theory, to reconcile the monstrous War System with the precepts of Christ! Instil it, teacher of childhood and youth, in the early thoughts of your precious charge; exhibit the wickedness of War, and the beauty of Peace; let these sink deep among those purifying and strengthening influences which shall ripen into a character of true manhood. Scholar! write it in your books. Poet! let it inspire to higher melodies your Christian song. Let the interests of commerce, whose threads of golden tissue interknit the nations, enlist all the traffickers of the earth in its behalf. And you, servant of the law! sharer of my own peculiar toils, mindful that the law is silent in the midst of arms, join in endeavors to preserve, uphold and extend its sway! Remember, politician! that our cause is too universal to become the exclusive possession of any political party, but that all are welcome beneath its white banner. And to you, statesman and ruler! let the principles of Peace be as a cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night. Let the Abolition of War, and the overthrow of the War System, with the Disarming of the Christian nations, be your constant aim! Be this your pious diplomacy! Be this your devoted Christian statesmanship!

As a measure, at once simple and practical, obnoxious to no objections, promising incalculable good, and presenting an immediate opportunity of labor in the cause, let me invite your instant active co-operation in the efforts now making by the friends of Peace, at home and abroad, to establish Arbitration Treaties among the nations. If there is a tendency only in this scheme to avert War; certainly, if we may hope through its agency to prevent a single war — and who can doubt that such may be its result? — we ought to adopt it. Make the initiative. Try it; and nations will be slow to return to their present system. They will begin to learn war no more. Let it be the high privilege of our country, through its representatives abroad, to volunteer the proposal to all civilized governments. Let it thus inaugurate the idea of Permanent Peace in the diplomacy of the world. Nor should it weakly wait for the movements of other governments. In a cause so holy, no government is justified in waiting for another to make the first advance. Let us, then, take the lead in this great work. Let our republic, the powerful child of Freedom, go forth, as the Evangelist of Peace. Let her offer to the world a Magna Charta of International

Law, by which the crime of War shall be forever abolished. Let her do this; and hers will be a Christian glory, by the side of which all the glory of battle shall be as the flashing of a bayonet by the side of the heavenly light which beamed from the countenance of Christ.

And now, while I thus encourage you in the cause of Universal Peace, the odious din of War mingled with pathetic appeals for Freedom, reaches us from struggling Italy, from convulsed Germany, from aroused and triumphant Hungary; the populous North, at the stern command of the Russian Autocrat, threatens to pour its barbarous multitudes upon the scene; and a portentous cloud, charged with "red lightnings and impetuous rage," hangs over the whole continent of Europe, as it echoes once again to the tread of mustering squadrons. Alas! must this dismal work be renewed? Can Freedom be born, can nations be regenerated, only through the abhorred baptism of blood? In our aspirations let us not be blind to the lessons of history, or to the actual condition of men, so long accustomed to brute force, that, to their imperfect natures, it seems the only means by which injustice can be crushed. With sadness let me say, I cannot expect the *domestic* repose of nations until tyranny is overthrown, and the principles of *self-government* established; especially do I not expect imperturbable peace in Italy, so long as foreign Austria continues to tread, with insolent iron heel, upon any part of that beautiful land. But whatever may be the fate of the present crisis, whether it be doomed to the horrors of prolonged fraternal strife, or whether it shall soon brighten into the radiance of enduring concord, I cannot doubt that the nations are now gravitating, with resistless might, even through fire and blood, into peaceful forms of social order, where the War System shall no longer be known.

Nay, from the very experience of this hour, let me draw the happy auguries of Permanent Peace. Not in international strife; not in duels between nation and nation; not in the selfish conflicts of ruler with ruler; not in the unwise "game" of War, as played by king with king, do we find the elements of the present commotions, "with fear of change perplexing monarchs." It is to overturn the enforced rule of military power, to crush the tyranny of armies, and to supplant unjust governments, — whose only stay is physical force, and not the consent of the governed, — that the people have at last risen

in mighty madness. So doing, they wage a battle in which all our sympathies must be with Freedom, while in our sorrow at the unwelcome combat, we confess that victory is only less mournful than defeat. But through all these bloody mists, with the eye of faith we may clearly discern the ascending sun of permanent Peace — struggling to shoot its lifegiving beams upon the outspread earth, already teeming with the powerful products of a new civilization.

Everywhere the glad signs of Progress salute us; and the promised land smiles at our approach. His soul is cold, his eye is dull, who does not perceive these things. Vainly has he read the history of the Past, vainly does he feel the irrepressible movement of the Present. Man has waded through a red sea of blood, and for forty centuries wandered through a wilderness of wretchedness and error, but he stands at last on the top of Pisgah; like the adventurous Spaniard, he has wearily climbed the lofty mountain heights whence he may descry the vast, unbroken Pacific sea; like the hardy Portuguese, he is sure to double this fearful Cape of Storms, destined ever afterwards to be called the Cape of Good Hope. Let me not seem too confident. I know not, that the nations will, in any brief periods like kindred drops, commingle into one; that, like the banyan-trees of the East, they will interlace and interlock, until there is no longer a single tree, but one forest,

. A pillard shade
High overarched, and echoing walks between;

but am I assured, that, without renouncing any essential qualities of individuality or independence, they may yet, even in our own day, arrange themselves in harmony; as magnetized iron rings — from which Plato once borrowed an image — under the influence of the potent, unseen attraction, while preserving each its own peculiar form, all cohere in a united chain of independent circles. From the birth of this new order will spring not only international repose, but domestic quiet also; and Peace will become the permanent ruler of the Christian States. The stone shall be rolled away from the sepulchre in which men have laid their Lord; and we shall hear the new-risen voice, saying, in words of blessed import, “Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world.”

And here I might fitly close. But, though admonished that I have already occupied more of your time than I could venture to claim, except for the cause in whose behalf I now speak, I cannot

forbear to consider, for a brief moment, yet one other topic, which I have left thus far untouched, partly because it was not directly connected with the question of the War System, and therefore seemed inappropriate to any earlier stage of the discussion, and partly because I wished, with my last words, to impress it upon your minds and upon your hearts. I refer to that greatest, most preposterous and most irreligious of earthly vanities, the monstrous reflexion of War — more worthy of the beasts of the field than of intelligent Christian men — *Military Glory*.

Let me not disguise the truth. It is too true that this is still cherished by mankind; that it is still an object of regard and ambition; that men follow War, and count its pursuit “honorable;” that the feats of brute force in battle are pronounced “brilliant;” and that a yet prevailing public opinion animates unreflecting and mistaken mortals to “seek the bubble *reputation* even in the cannon’s mouth.” It is too true, that nations persevere in offering praise and thanksgiving — such as no labors of Beneficence can achieve — to the chief whose hands are red with the blood of his fellow men.

But whatever may be the usage of the world, whether during the long and dreary Past, or in the yet barbarous Present, it must be clear to all who are willing to confront this question with candor, and in the light of unquestioned principles and examples, that all “glory,” won in bloody strife among God’s children, must be fugitive, evanescent, unreal — unstable as water, worthless as ashes. It is the offspring of a deluded public sentiment, and must certainly disappear, as men learn to analyze its elements, and to appreciate its true character. Too long, indeed, has mankind worshipped what St. Augustine called the *splendid vices*, neglecting the simple virtues. Too long has mankind cultivated the flaunting and noxious weeds, careless of the golden corn which produces the bread of life. Too long has mankind been insensible to those Christian precepts, and to that high example, which, whatever may be the apologies of self-defence, rebuke all the pretensions of military glory.

Look for one moment at this “glory.” Analyze it in the growing light which is shed by the lamps of history. Regarding War as an established Arbitrament for the adjudication of controversies among nations, — like the Petty Wars of an earlier period between cities, principalities and provinces, and the Trial by Battle between individuals, — the conclusion is irresistible, that an enlightened civiliza-

tion must condemn all the partakers in its duels, and all their vaunted achievements, precisely as we now condemn all the partakers in those miserable contests which disfigure the commencement of modern history. The prowess of the individual is all forgotten in unutterable disgust at the inglorious barbarism of the strife in which it was displayed.

Observe yet again this "glory," in the broad illumination of Christian truth. In all ages, even in heathen lands, men have looked with peculiar reverence upon the relation of Brotherhood. Feuds among brothers, from that earliest "mutual murdering" contest beneath the walls of Thebes, have been accounted dismal and abhorred; never to be mentioned without condemnation and aversion. This sentiment was revived in modern times; and men sought to extend the holy circle of its influence. According to curious and savage custom, valiant knights, desirous of associating as brothers, voluntarily caused themselves to be bled together, that the blood of each other, as it spirted from the veins, might intermingle, and thus constitute them of *one blood*. By this peculiar sanction, the powerful emperor of Constantinople confirmed an alliance of friendship with a crusading king. The two monarchs being first bled together, drank of each other's blood, in token of Brotherhood; and their attendants, following the princely example, bled each other, caught the flowing blood in a wine-cup, and then drank a mutual pledge, saying "We are brothers of *one blood*."

Alas! by such profane and superfluous devices have men, in their barbarism, sought to establish that relation of Brotherhood, whose beauty and holiness they perceived, though they failed to discern that, by the ordinance of God, without any human stratagem, it justly comprehended all their fellow-men. In the midst of Judaism, which hated all nations, Christianity proclaimed love to all mankind, and distinctly declared that God had made of *one blood* all the nations of men. And as, if to keep this sublime truth ever present to the mind, the disciples were taught, in the simple prayer of the Saviour, to address God as their Father in Heaven not in phrase of exclusive worship, as "*my* Father;" but in those other words of high Christian import, "*Our* Father;" with the petition not merely "to forgive *me my* trespasses," but with a diviner prayer, "to forgive *us our* trespasses;" thus in the solitude of the closet, recognizing all alike as children of God, and embracing all alike in the petition of prayer.

Confessing the Fatherhood of God, and the consequent Brother-

hood of Mankind, we find at once a divine standard, of unquestionable accuracy and applicability, by which to estimate the achievements of battle. No brother can win "glory" from the death of a brother. Cain won no "glory," when he slew Abel; nor would Abel have won "glory," had he, in the exercise of strict self-defence, succeeded in slaying the wicked Cain. The soul recoils in horror from the thought of praise or honor, as the meed of any such melancholy, hateful success. And what is true of a contest between two brothers, is equally true of a contest between *many*. No army can win "glory" by dealing death or defeat to an army of his brothers.

The ancient Romans, ignorant of this sacred and most comprehensive relation, and recognizing only the exclusive fellowship which springs from a common country, accounted *civil war* as *fratricidal*. They branded the opposing forces—even under well-loved names in the Republic—as *impious*; and constantly refused "honor," "thanksgiving," or "triumph," to the conquering chief whose sword had been employed against his *fellow-citizens*, even though traitors and rebels. As the Brotherhood of mankind—now professed by Christian lips—becomes practically recognised, it will be impossible to restrain our regard within the exclusive circle of country, and to establish an unchristian distinction of honor between *civil war* and *international war*. *As all men are brothers, so, by irresistible consequence, ALL WAR MUST BE FRATRICIDAL.* And can "glory" come from fratricide? No, no. Shame and sorrow must attend it; nor can any war, under whatever apology of necessity it may be vindicated, be justly made the occasion of "honor," of "thanksgiving," or of "triumph." Surely none can hesitate in this conclusion, who are not fatally imbued with the Heathen rage of nationality, that made the Venetians say, "they were Venetians first, and Christians afterwards."

Tell me not, then, of the homage which the world yet offers to the military chieftain. Tell me not of the "glory" of War. Tell me not of the "honor" or "fame," won on its murderous fields. All is vanity. It is a blood-red phantom, sure to fade and disappear. They who strive after it, Ixion-like, embrace a cloud. Though seeming for a while to fill the heavens, cloaking the stars, it must, like the vapors of earth, pass away. Milton likens the early contests of the Heptarchy to the skirmishes of crows and kites; but God, and the exalted Christianity of the Future, must regard all the bloody feuds of men in the same likeness; looking upon Napoleon and Alexan-

der, so far as they were engaged in war, only as monster crows and kites. Thus shall it be, as mankind ascends from the thrall of brutish passions. Nobler aims, by nobler means, shall fill the soul. A new standard of excellence shall prevail; and honor, divorced from all deeds of blood, shall become the inseparable attendant of good works alone. Far better, then, shall it be, even in the judgment of this world, to have been a door-keeper in the house of Peace, than the proudest dweller in the tents of War.

There is a legend of the early Church, that the Saviour left his image miraculously impressed upon a napkin which had been placed upon his countenance. The napkin was lost, and men attempted to portray that countenance from the Heathen models of Jupiter and Apollo. But the image of Christ is not lost to the world. Clearer than in the precious napkin, clearer than in the colors or the marble of modern art, it appears in every virtuous deed, in every act of self-sacrifice, in all magnanimous toil, in every recognition of the Brotherhood of Mankind. It will yet be supremely manifest, in unimagined loveliness and serenity, when the Commonwealth of Nations, confessing the True Grandeur of Peace, renounces the wickedness of the War System, and dedicates to labors of Beneficence all the comprehensive energies now so fatally absorbed in its support. Then, at last, shall it be seen, that *there can be no Peace that is not honorable, and there can be no War that is not dishonorable.*

APPENDIX.

HON. J. R. UNDERWOOD'S REPORT,

MADE TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEB. 23. 1853.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the memorial of the American Peace Society, signed by its principal officers, and various other memorials, numerously signed, from many States of the Union, praying for the adoption of measures to avert the evils of war, and suggesting the propriety of "securing in our treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation," have had the same under consideration, and now report :

That the subjects of these memorials is of vast importance, involving inquiries into the effects produced by war upon the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious welfare of mankind, and, if these effects be found deleterious, then the consideration of plans to arrest the evil.

The committee, after due deliberation, are of opinion, that wars which successfully resist oppression may, in their results, more than compensate for the blood and treasure expended in their prosecution. But wars commenced to maintain the rights of the people, when unsuccessfully terminated, only strengthen the hands of despotism, and generally place those who have taken up arms to resist wrong, in a worse condition than they were in the beginning. The revolution by which the people of the United States broke the dominion of Great Britain, and established a free popular government, furnishes an instance where the consequences of war have fully compensated the expenditure. But this is a rare instance in the history of revolutions. It is unnecessary to refer to those which have attempted, and have failed, leaving the oppressed in a worse condition after than before the war.

While the committee do not intend to deny the right of any people or nation to resort to war for the purpose of ridding themselves of oppression, or of defending themselves against aggression, when it cannot be accomplished by peaceable means, yet they regard the tendencies of war to be injurious to the progress of mankind in science, art, morals, civilization and happiness; and hence it can be justified only upon the ground, that it is a less evil than that which can be avoided only by the resort to war. In this view, war presents itself as a choice between evils.

That war is an evil of stupendous magnitude in its effects upon the physical welfare of mankind, no one can deny who regards and reasons upon incontrovertible facts. The business of war is to force and secure submission on the part of the enemy, by inflicting a destruction of life and property. The purpose of a campaign is to conquer, to subdue the enemy. The means to accomplish it are found in the sacrifice of life in bloody battles, in the sacking of cities, in the devastation of countries, in the sinking of ships, in the seizure and confiscation of cargoes, and in forcing contributions from those who are overrun. The immediate object of war is to create human misery to such a degree, that those who suffer will thereby be influenced to yield to the demands, whether right or

wrong, of those who inflict the injury, rather than prolong their sufferings by a continuance of the war. Under such a system, fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers are consigned, in the vigor of manhood, to sudden death, and their bodies often abandoned without burial, leaving mothers, wives, daughters and sisters, to lament with excruciating anguish the loss of that society which constituted their chief earthly happiness. But, even if they survive the battle, it may be at the expense of an eye, an arm, or a leg; and, when they retire from the army, if their bodies are not maimed and mutilated, their physical constitutions are often broken down, and they fall early victims to diseases, contracted in the service. It is needless to comment upon the distress and wretchedness which families experience when deprived of those who supplied the wants of women and children with food and raiment. Every person can call to mind some known and familiar instance of a family whose comfort and happiness have been destroyed by the consequences of war. Individual and family sufferings are the confluent particles which form the great streams of national calamity; and the committee, without dwelling upon them, will proceed to present some general considerations and facts which, they trust, will exhibit the evils of war in a light so striking as to induce every patriot and philanthropist to labor for its extermination.

Armies, to render efficient service, must be composed of intelligent, able-bodied men—such as are capable, in civil employments, to increase greatly the products of agriculture, mechanism, and commerce, upon which the physical comforts of every people essentially depend. Abstract the labor of 100,000 men from the tillage of the earth, from the mechanic and manufacturing arts, and from the business of commerce, convert them into soldiers; and what consequences naturally follow the procedure?

The first is, that they become consumers, instead of producers—maintained, not by their own, but by the labor of others. However actively and industriously they may be engaged to meet and overcome the enemy, all their labors for such purposes, instead of adding to, only consume and waste, the food and raiment and implements furnished by the labor of others. The consequence is, that the laboring producers must work harder, to keep up their own customary supplies, and to support, in addition, the army of consumers and non-producers whose business it is to live on the labor of their friends, and to destroy the lives and property of their enemies.

The second consequence is, that the 100,000 men, taken from the industrial pursuits which create the means of comfortable living, and placed in an army to lead the life of soldiers, must be furnished with the implements and munitions which belong to their new trade of destruction. Swords, pistols, rifles, muskets, bayonets, cannon, powder, balls, and bombshells must be fabricated and supplied. In addition, there must be the means of transportation by land and water. Beasts of burden, and wagons of all sorts, and without number, must be provided. Water-crafts of all kinds and dimensions, from the common ferry-boat to the magnificent three-decked man-of-war ship, must be constructed or purchased. When a suitable armament is obtained, and military and naval operations begin, every movement is attended with deterioration and waste of material, making a perpetual renewal absolutely necessary. The forage for horses, mules, and oxen, and the destruction and loss of animals and carriages attached to armies, constitute no inconsiderable item to be kept up by the labor of the country which furnishes the supplies.

The third consequence is, that, if the laboring classes, upon whom the burden falls of supporting the non-producing army in food and raiment, and of providing the munitions of war to render the army efficient, cannot do it for want of means, and the government under which they live cannot therefore venture to increase the taxes, the people and their government are driven by the urgency of circumstances to anticipate their revenues by borrowing money. Hence the creation of national debts, and with them a new set of non-producers, who live sumptuously upon the interest of their money, and by dealing in stocks. Thus the living generation are often required to toil and labor to discharge the principal and interest of national debts created in former ages. Besides the current

and necessary annual expenditures of government, they are called on to pay the debts of centuries, and taxation becomes an intolerable burden.

That these are the natural consequences of war, no one can doubt who is at all acquainted with the history of nations, and their public debts. Exempted as are the people of the United States from oppressive taxation to meet the interest of their public debt, and small as that debt is compared with the debts of other nations whose resources are not equal to ours, yet it is well known that nearly the whole of our debt, exceeding on the first of January last, \$65 000,000, has been the result of war. To show the burdens which wars entail on nations by public debts, the committee herewith present two tables, taken from Hunt's Merchants' Magazine of May, 1843. The first exhibits the public debt of Great Britain, taken from the budget of 1840, at various periods in British history; and the other gives the amount, in German dollars, of the debt of many nations of Europe, their population, and average of debt to each inhabitant.* These tables may not be perfectly accurate, but, no doubt, approximate the truth sufficiently near for every purpose of fair argument and illustration. Taking into consideration the debts of the smaller European States and free cities, and adding them to the aggregate of debt as stated in the second table, it may be safely affirmed, that the total public debt of the States of Europe was not less than eight thousand millions of dollars in 1840!† The annual interest on this enormous amount of debt, supposing it to average only four per cent. per annum, is equal to three hundred and twenty millions of dollars each year. In other words, each man, woman, and child, if the interest were raised by a capitation tax, would have to contribute \$1.29 per annum, in addition to the sums necessary to meet the annual expenditures of government for other purposes, estimating the countries which owe the debts to contain a population of 248,000,000. Turkey in Europe has been omitted in these calculations, because the committee had no data before them upon which that country could be included.

If we consider, by way of contrast, the more beneficial uses to which war-taxes and war-debts might be applied, could wars be avoided, we shall see more clearly the immense losses and deprivations which mankind have sustained in consequence of devoting their energies and resources to the purposes of war. Thus the interest on the European debt would pay an annual salary of \$400 to eight hundred thousand teachers of children. These teachers, allowing thirty children to each, could instruct twenty-four millions of children, of suitable ages, in the usual branches of a common education—as reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and grammar. Thus the debts of the States of Europe, created by wars, would, as an education fund, teach every child of suitable age within their territories, those rudiments of learning which open the door to the highest attainments in science. What blessings would this confer upon the children of the

*TABLE I.—*Public Debt of Great Britain.*

	Principal.	Int. & Mangt.
Debt of Great Britain at the Revolution in 1689.	£664,263	£39,855
Excess of debt contracted during the reign of William III. above debt paid off.	17,730,439	1,771,087
Debt at the accession of Queen Ann in 1702.	16,394,702	1,310,982
Debt contracted during Queen Ann's reign.	37 750,661	2,040,416
Debt at the accession of George I. in 1714.	54,145,363	3,351,358
Debt paid off during the reign of George I. above debt contracted.	5,053,125	1,33,807
Debt at the accession of George II. in 1747.	52,092,237	2,217,551
Debt contracted from the accession of George II. till the peace of Paris in 1763, three years after the accession of George III.	86,773,192	2,634,500
Debt in 1763.	138,865,430	4,852,051
Paid during peace from 1763 to 1775.	10,281,795	380,480
Debt at the commencement of the American war in 1775.	125,583,635	4,471,541
Debt contracted during the American war.	121,267,993	4,980,201
Debt at the conclusion of the American war in 1784.	249,851,638	9,451,772
Paid during peace from 1784 to 1793.	10,501,380	243,277
Debt at the commencement of the French war in 1793.	239,350,148	9,208,497
Debt contracted during the French war.	601,500,343	22,829,679
Total funded and unfunded debt on the 1st of February, 1817, when the English and Irish exchequers were consolidated.	840,850,491	33,038,291
Debt cancelled from February 1, 1817 to January 5, 1838.	48,544,049	2,576,703
Debt and charge thereon January 5, 1838.	792,306,442	29,461,528

†Table II—see next page.

lower classes of Paris and of London; and not only these, but upon the children of all the poor, whose circumstances prohibit the expenditure of money, even if they had it, in educating their children.

The interest for one year on European war-debts would construct eight thousand miles of railroad, and provide depots, locomotives, cars, and everything needful for the transportation of freight and travellers, at a cost per mile not exceeding \$40,000. Thus a railroad might be constructed from Paris to Canton, in China, for less than a year's interest on the war-debts of Europe.

The interest payable annually upon war-debts, is but a small portion of the annual burden imposed upon the people for war-purposes. The expense of keeping and sustaining large standing armies and navies is tenfold greater than paying the interest on national debts. And, although the nations of Europe have been at peace for many years, from recent information it appears, that there has been no diminution of their military establishments. The following extract, taken from a recent publication in London, and which refers to Parliamentary papers and the budgets for the year 1835 and 1852 in support of the truth of the statements, exhibits the condition of things on this point in regard to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The publication states: "While its (United Kingdom) national debt has not been materially diminished, its war establishment has been fearfully increased. In the space of seventeen years, namely, from 1835 to 1852, its armed men have multiplied from 145,846 in the one period, to 272,481 in the other, being an addition, in those comparatively few years, no less than 126,635 men in arms" The publication proceeds to state, that an additional force of 80,000 men had recently been provided for "in the form of a militia at a cost of £350,000 (\$1,750,000)† to the country

† TABLE II.—*Debts of Europe in German dollars—equal to about eighty two cents of the United States currency.*

Countries.	Debt.	No inhab'ts.	Avg. to ea. inhab't.
Holland,	800,000,000	3,000,000	266 66
England,	5,556,000,000	25,000,000	2 2 24
Frankfort-on-the-Maine,	5,000,000	55,000	90 91
France,	1,800,000,000	33,000,000	54 54
Bremen,	3,000,000	55,000	54 54
Hamburg,	7,000,000	155,000	45 16
Denmark,	98,000,000	2,100,000	44 57
Greece,	44,000,000	1,000,000	44 00
Portugal,	144,000,000	3,800,000	38 63
Lubeck,	1,700,000	45,000	97 78
Spain,	457,000,000	13,000,000	35 92
Austria,	330,000,000	12,000,000	31 67
Belgium,	120,000,000	4,000,000	30 09
Papal States,	67,000,000	2,500,000	26 80
Hesse Hamburg,	587,000	25,000	23 48
Saxe Meinengen,	3,000,000	140,000	21 43
Anhalt Rothen,	800,000	39,000	20 51
Brunswick,	5,000,000	260,000	19 23
Bavaria,	72,350,000	4,250,000	17 00
Naples,	126,000,000	7,600,000	16 58
Saxe Weimar,	3,000,000	240,000	12 50
Hanover,	19,000,000	1,700,000	11 47
Prussia,	150,000,000	13,500,000	11 11
Nassau,	3,700,000	370,000	10 00
Russia and Poland,	545,000,000	60,000,000	9 09
Baden,	11,000,000	1,250,000	8 80
Wurtenburg,	14,000,000	1,600,000	8 75
Parma,	3,700,000	430,000	8 60
Hesse Darmstadt,	6,250,000	800,000	7 81
Modena,	3,000,000	403,000	7 44
Sardinia,	32,000,000	4,500,000	7 11
Saxony,	11,000,000	1,700,000	6 47
Saxe Altenburg,	700,000	120,000	5 83

States whose debts do not amount to \$5 for each inhabitant are omitted. Total 10,499,710,000. A German authority, quoted by Hunt's Mer. Mag., Nov. 1851, puts the war debts of Europe at 11,397,076,000 German dollars.—ED.

†The militia is found (Oct. 1853) to cost some \$3,000,000.—ED.

and more recently still, they (the ministry,) have demanded and obtained, for an increased navy, another sum of £600,000, (3,000,000.) making together one million sterling taken from the income of the empire in 1852, in addition to the large annual expenditure for similar purposes." The same publication states, that "in 1835 the whole cost of the army, navy, and ordnance of Great Britain was £11,657,487 sterling (\$58,287,435;) in 1852, the charge for the same departments (including the Caffre war, &c.) has risen to the startling sum of £16,500,000, (\$82,500,000,) being an increase of no less than £4,842,513 sterling, and this does not include the £600,000 recently added to the navy." We shall conclude these extracts by giving the commentary of the writer on the preceding facts. He says; "The injury which this immense drain on our national resources must inflict upon commerce, is incalculable. Take Manchester and Salford as an instance; their united population of about 400,000 inhabitants, according to the existing average of taxation, pay *annually*, for past present and future wars, no less than the astonishing sum of £875,000, (\$4,375,000, or \$10 per head!) and at this rate such a population, during the last thirty years of peace, will have lost from their united resources, for war-purposes alone, the almost overwhelming sum of not less than *twenty five millions sterling!* What the inhabitants of these two great boroughs could have accomplished with this vast amount, defies all description; but it is undeniable that solid improvements, and on a scale of the most commanding magnitude, in all the social, sanitary and intellectual departments of activity, might have been carried out to their full completion by those resources which, through a system of warlike extravagance, are now for ever lost. The inhabitants of the United Kingdom at large will have contributed to this extravagant outlay during the thirty years of peace, the perfectly bewildering amount of more than *one thousand two hundred and fifty millions sterling!!* — (\$6,250,000,000.)

"Nor does the agricultural market suffer less, in proportion, than the manufacturing, of which the following statement is a convincing and melancholy proof. Its 600,000 laborers, who with their families amount to nearly two millions and a half of the entire population, will not receive as wages for their whole year's toil, more than fifteen millions sterling, (\$75,000,000;) while, for armed men alone, the country will pay as stated above, upwards of sixteen millions (80,000,000) for the same space of time. Thus the tillers of the soil, whose hard and honest labor provides the substance of our daily bread, will receive for that labor millions less than men in arms, who of necessity must be mere idlers in the State, except when engaged in the work of mutual destruction."

It might seem useless further to pursue these investigations in reference to the States of Europe. But it is deemed proper to make a brief reference to the state of things now, or very recently, existing in France, taken from a translation of an article published in the *Siecle*. From this it appears that in France and Algeria there are kept up "102 regiments of infantry, ten battalions of foot chasseurs, three regiments of zouaves, three battalions of African light infantry, and nineteen companies of discipline. These corps contain 261,095 officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, at an expense of pay and living alone of 78,000,000, francs, (equal to \$14,820,000.) The article proceeds to say: "Our fifty-eight regiments of cavalry, two squadrons of guides, four companies of the body called *Cavaliers de Remonte*, contain 61,187 men and 44,707 horses, at an expense of 57,000,000 francs, (equal to \$10,830,000.) The artillery — which is divided into fourteen regiments, a regiment of pontoneers, four squadrons of park artillery, and thirteen companies of workmen — consists of 32,000 men and 748 horses, and the wagon train of 5000 men and 4425 horses. The gendarmerie and veterans form a chapter of the budget apart."

The number of the gendarmerie and veterans is not stated, nor the annual sum required for their support. Neither is the annual cost of the artillery, engineers and wagon-train given. But, supposing that it is equal, in proportion, to that of the cavalry, it is not less than 33,683,000 francs, or \$6,399,770. Thus the army of France, exclusive of the gendarmerie and veterans, composed of 368,572 men and 61,018 horses, costs annually, to pay and support them, more than \$30,000,000 in peace. This estimate does not include the navy of France.

According to the foregoing data, the standing armies of Great Britain and France exceed 640,000 men. Including the armies of all other European States, the number cannot fall short of 2,000,000 men, without taking any account of the naval armaments and number of marines, sailors, and officers.* Your committee have seen a publication in which it is estimated, that the annual charge upon the people of Europe to maintain their military establishment, is not less than \$500,000,000, and to pay the interest on their national debts not less than \$300,000,000. In the opinion of the committee, these estimates are fully sustained by the data they have examined. The thought is appalling, that the laboring and productive classes of Europe should be annually taxed to the extent of \$800,000,000 to pay interest on war-debts, and to support millions of men, withdrawn from the arts of agriculture, commerce, and mechanism, in idleness during peace, and to prepare them to destroy each other in time of war!

We will close these investigations by remarking, that our own public debt, nearly all of which is the consequence of war, and the expense of our army and navy a single year — the army having cost \$8,689,530, and the the navy, including dry-docks and ocean steam mail contracts, \$7,450,300, during the fiscal year ending in June, 1853, according to official reports — would build a railroad, at \$35,000 per mile, from the Mississippi river to San Francisco, in California. A single year's interest at six per cent, on the amount of our national debt, and the amount expended for military and naval purposes during the last fiscal year, would pay a salary exceeding \$200 to one hundred school teachers in every congressional district in the United States. We shall only allude to the system of pensions, and the burthens entailed on nations to support pensioners. For the next fiscal year, to meet these claims, more than \$2,000,000, according to the Secretary's report, will be wanting. All this is the consequence of war.

The facts and considerations already presented are enough to show what mankind have lost by applying their labors and money in scourging nations with the calamities of war. Had the labor and money, thus thrown away in making nations miserable, been applied in constructing roads and canals and telegraphs, in supplying towns and cities with pure water and other improvements, in building churches and school-houses, in procuring books and apparatus, and in paying teachers to instruct children, instead of paying soldiers to butcher their fellow men in cold blood without knowing whom they are killing; if this wasted labor and money had been used with a view to the physical, intellectual and moral advancement of mankind, the imagination cannot grasp the incalculable blessings which would have been the result.

We shall not dwell upon the deleterious effects of war upon the moral and intellectual progress of mankind. To trace its consequences, and to show that no people can advance, when maddened and harassed by the intense excitements and engagements which occupy them in a state of war, as they could in peace, would be to waste time in proving a self-evident proposition. We therefore dismiss this part of the subject, and take up the inquiry whether it be possible to prescribe a remedy for the evils of war, and, if so, what is the remedy.

It is an axiom, sanctioned by the experience of mankind in all ages and under all circumstances, that no one can be trusted as judge in his own case. Civil governments are based upon the idea, that disinterested tribunals must be established in order to administer justice between contending individuals, and their conflicting claims. If individuals, members of the same society, and residing in the same neighborhood, cannot be allowed to judge of the extent of their injuries, and to redress, each for himself, the wrong of which he complains, because of his incapacity, under the influence of selfishness, to perceive what justice requires, and to keep himself within the boundaries of exact justice when he undertakes to right himself, how is it more reasonable that States, being only the aggregate of individuals, should, through their governments, be allowed to judge

*In 1850, Baron von Reden, a very able statistician in Germany, stated that there were at that time full four millions actually under arms in Europe.—*Ed.*

exclusively of the wrong suffered, and the extent and nature of the remedy to be applied? Are aggregates of men, or associated multitudes, exempt from all the passions, prejudices and selfishness which operate upon the individuals who compose them? Are governments less influenced by the spirit of aggression and aggrandizement than individuals? We think the history of nations furnishes a negative answer to these questions. The peace, happiness and good order of society imperatively demand the establishment of courts of justice, in which disinterested judges shall settle individual controversies; and we believe that civilization could hardly exist among any people where each individual was allowed to be the judge and avenger of his own wrongs. That governments should be allowed so to exercise privileges and powers in deciding their disputes with other governments, which could not for a moment be conceded to individuals, can be tolerated only upon the ground of necessity. It may be said, and with truth in the present posture of the affairs of the world, that there is no superior, paramount authority to which nations can apply for redress against each other, and therefore each must judge and redress for itself the wrong it suffers. We shall not deny this position in respect either to individual nations or governments, when they are independent, and not subject to the control of some higher power. Savages, in a state of nature, without the restraint of laws, must judge and act for themselves. Each must redress his own wrong, or engage others to assist him, as best he may. But as men have emerged from a state of nature into the social system of establishing government, and surrendered the right of self-redress, except in cases where threatened spoliation and injuries may be averted by self-defence, and have been eminently blessed by making the surrender, it is worthy of the gravest consideration, whether nations and governments may not establish a tribunal into whose hands their right of self-redress may be safely surrendered. The several States, constituting the people and government of the United States under the control of the federal or national constitution, have surrendered their right of self-redress against each other, and against foreign nations and governments, in many highly important particulars. Perhaps it is not going too far to say, that this right has been fully surrendered to the general government in all cases where the injury complained of has been fully perpetrated and completed, retaining, however, the fullest right to repel the infliction of injuries from any quarter which may be attempted, and which are not consummated—just as any citizen may defend his person, his family, or his property against violent attacks, notwithstanding his surrender of the right of self-redress to his government in most cases. In the opinion of some of the committee, the day will come, in the progress of intelligence and Christianity, when nations will unite in establishing a tribunal in which all international controversies shall be adjudged and determined; but, as the committee do not at present intend to recommend measures to that extent, they forbear to go into details of the plan of its operation, or the reasons in support of it.

All that the committee are willing to advise and recommend for the present is, that in the treaties which are hereafter to be made with foreign nations, it shall be stipulated between the contracting parties, that all differences which may arise shall be referred to arbitrators for adjustment. Under such stipulation, the board of arbitrators, or the single arbitrator, would be selected after the occurrence of the difficulty. Each party would be careful to select impartial persons, distinguished for their virtues and talents, and each would have the opportunity of objecting to any one proposed who might not possess these high qualities. In the opinion of the committee, the arbitrators should be eminent jurists having little or no connection with political affairs. If the parties could not agree in the selection of arbitrators, and could not themselves settle the controversy by a new treaty, then either might undertake to redress, according to its own judgment, the grievance complained of. But, before a resort to arms, in order to retain the respect of mankind, it would be necessary to make an honest effort to select capable and impartial arbitrators. The trickery to defeat the arbitration, and at the same time apparently comply with the requirements of the treaty, would be certain to bring general odium on the guilty party, to avoid which nations and individuals, in this age of the world, will do much.

It may be objected, that the arbitrators, through imbecility or corruption, may

err in their award. It is not likely they will be destitute of capacity. If they are, it will be the fault of those who select such. But suppose they are corrupt, and should render an award palpably unjust, what is then to be done? It is a legal maxim, that fraud vitiates everything. All contracts, judgments and awards fraudulently obtained, are to be set aside, and held for naught; and there is a chancery jurisdiction provided in well-regulated governments to supervise and annul every transaction based upon fraud. Now, in case the arbitrators should make a fraudulent award, then the party injured by it must of necessity, as there is no higher jurisdiction to supervise and annul it, refuse to execute it, and publish to the world their reasons for the refusal. If, in doing so, it could be shown that the award was the result of partiality or corruption, the honest sentiment of mankind would justify the nation injured by it in resisting its execution by war, should milder means prove ineffectual. Thus, in case national differences are submitted to arbitrators for adjustment, and the award should be of such a character that one of the parties cannot submit to, resistance and war may be resorted to in the end.

It may be asked, why go through the forms of arbitration, unless the award is to be conclusive and final? What good can result from the delay, the expense, and the ceremonies of an arbitration, if the parties to it may, after it is over, still renew the quarrel, and go to war? We answer, much good. The necessary delay in selecting the arbitrators, and preparing for and conducting the trial, will prevent hasty declarations of war. It will allow time for the blood to cool, and for the mind to reflect. Calm deliberation is the friend of peace. The award will show the contending nations what opinion disinterested judges entertain of their quarrel. Just and able arbitrators will, by their reasonings in regard to the controversy, exhibit the right and justice of the case, and the wrong committed by one or both parties, in such a clear light, that all disinterested persons will perceive what ought to be done for the true interest of the disputants. An award sanctioned by the common sense and justice of the world, could not be resisted by either party, unless ruin, manifest and inevitable, would be the consequence of executing it. In that event, there is a higher principle which would allow resistance — the principle of self-preservation. Nations and individuals may sometimes be placed in such circumstances, that they may rightfully refuse to execute their engagements, entered into through improvidence, want of forecast, or pressing necessity. Many examples might be given by way of illustration; but we shall mention only one case. By treaty made in 1778, the United States agreed to guaranty to France, "forever, against all other powers, her present possessions in America." The alliance with France, which so essentially aided us in the war of the Revolution, if we are not entirely indebted to it for our national independence, required us to take part in her future wars, so far at least as to make good the above guaranty. But the Father of his Country, considering the imminent peril which we should incur by the fulfilment of this stipulation of the treaty, issued his celebrated proclamation of neutrality, in 1793, refusing to take part on the side of France against England in the war then raging, even to protect the French West India colonies. So, likewise, where nations refer a controversy to arbitration, and the award is such as to put the very existence of the unsuccessful party in jeopardy by its specific execution, the nation decided against is not bound to sacrifice itself. In all such cases, however, there is the strongest moral obligation to make adequate compensation, if it be possible. Thus there can be no danger to the real interest of any nation likely to result from the submission of disputes with other nations to arbitration, as the question of executing the award will remain open after it has been made; and its execution may be resisted for sufficient cause. But just arbitrators will always regard the condition of the party against whom the award is to be made, and will not require impossible things — things that are morally impossible, because they cannot be conceded without ruin.

Nations, by a reference of their disputes to arbitrators, might reasonably calculate that, however onerous the award, its fulfilment would not cost as much as the resort to war. If its execution presents a burden somewhat oppressive, still that which would be saddled upon the people by war, in all probability would be more grievous.

It sometimes happens, that the "point of honor" between nations seems to demand immediate action, and a blow is given without time for deliberation. The nation struck resents, and a war is the consequence. Treaty stipulations requiring arbitration, would be a salutary remedy in such cases. The "point of honor" would then consist in adhering to the treaty.

Contemplated in all its aspects, the committee perceive no evils likely to result from treaty stipulations in favor of referring national disputes to arbitration for adjustment. Believing that much good will result, they do not hesitate to recommend, as a part of our permanent foreign policy, the incorporation of a provision in all treaties to the effect that, should controversies arise, they shall be submitted to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen, with the privilege on the part of the arbitrators to select an umpire, in case they are equally divided.

The present state of the world is peculiarly favorable for the introduction of such a policy. The powerful Christian nations are at peace with each other. Their prosperity and happiness have been rapidly advancing during the years of peace they have enjoyed. No greater calamity can befall them than breaking up their peace which so happily prevails.

The United States, of all others, is the proper country to propose this policy to the nations of the earth. We have shown in our past history a capacity for war. The love of military glory is a passion as strong with us as with any other people, if not stronger. Our institutions invite every citizen to become a soldier in time of war. Our ranks are filled with volunteers panting for an opportunity to distinguish themselves. Our young men rush to battle with the full assurance, that the highest civil honors often reward the toils and dangers of the triumphant soldier. Our institutions, therefore, tend to make us a military people. We are rapidly growing in power. Our progress is without a parallel. Under such circumstances, in proposing a policy of peace, it cannot be supposed that we are influenced by any other motives than those which spring from the purest philanthropy. The policy proposed is adverse to aggression. It respects the rights of all nations. Its object is "peace on earth, good will to men."

May we not hope to be successful in our efforts for peace? So far as national arbitrations have been tried, we do not know any case where the award, however complained of, has been pro luctive of a hundredth part of the evil which would have resulted from war. Take any award which has been rendered, concede it to be wrong, admit the arbitrators were mistaken and erred in judgment, and then weigh and compare the evils which would result from the execution of such award with those which follow a state of war; and it will be found that war is infinitely the greater evil. So far as past experience can be relied on, we think it favors the policy of adopting national arbitrations as the best means of settling national disputes.

There are powerful and rapidly accumulating interests in favor of peace, and adverse to war. The interests of commerce, which, through the enterprise of Christian nations, has penetrated almost every region of the earth, binding our race together by a more intimate intercourse and stronger fellowship, would be greatly injured by a state of war. These interests appeal to the rulers of mankind, and ask for peace.

The interests of science, civilization and Christianity implore the governments of the world to suppress wars. The scientific traveller desires to explore every square mile of the globe, to study its botany, and mineralogy, its reptiles, birds and beasts, its soils and climates, its population, and their manners and customs, their laws and religion, and thus to acquire and diffuse that knowledge which will enlarge and liberalize the mind, instruct commerce where to find supplies to purchase, and markets in which to sell, and teach agriculture by spreading the knowledge of the implements and tillage and productions best suited for the various soils and climates of the earth, as ascertained by the experience of centuries. War obstructs all this, because during a state of war, travellers are regarded with suspicion, if not arrested as spies.

Civilization and Christianity are making vigorous efforts to penetrate and enlighten the dark lands of barbarism and idolatry. The devout missionary

looks forward with undoubting faith to the period when peace, universal and permanent, shall pervade the earth ; when nations " shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning hooks," and when " nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." He believes that the day is coming when the tactics of death and destruction will cease to be a study among men. He believes that the promised Messiah has come; that " of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end," and that " he shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." He believes, that this great purpose is to be brought about by human agency, acting under the influence of the Spirit of God ; and with this faith, he goes forth to " preach the gospel to every creature," according to the command of his divine Master. His mission is one of love and peace. His purpose is to elevate man by instructing his mind and soul, and to make him a new creature in Christ Jesus. This work of missions, as the best means of converting heathen nations to the doctrines and faith of Christianity, has grown in popular favor with all classes of Christians. It has been adopted alike by Catholic and Protestant. It is relied on to bring all nations into a common brotherhood, by spreading over the earth a common religion, in which the same Decalogue, the same moral principles, shall be taught and embraced by all. This great object of Christian effort would be obstructed, if not entirely defeated, by the prevalence of wars. It is difficult where peace and commercial intercourse exist between a Christian and an anti-Christian nation, for the missionary of the former to penetrate the territories, and conciliate the favor and esteem of the heathen! It would be impossible in a state of war.

The committee believe, that the petitions presented to them indicate that there is a strong religious and philanthropic sentiment pervading our whole country in favor of peace among all nations. The sentiment is universal among Christians of all denominations, in the opinion of the committee, and is manifesting itself through the petitions before us. The political strength of the Christians of our country is such as to command attention and respect on all occasions, even if we did not entirely concur in their views ; but when, as in this case, the members of the committee heartily concur with what they believe to be the Christian sentiment of the country, it is an occasion for congratulation that they have the opportunity of co-operating with the memorialists in efforts to accomplish their noble purpose.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate advise the President to secure, whenever it may be practicable, a stipulation in all treaties hereafter entered into with other nations, providing for the adjustment of any misunderstanding or controversy which may arise between the contracting parties, by referring the same to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen.